arXiv:1602.08357v2 [cs.NE] 15 Jun 2016

Cortical Computation via Iterative Constructions

Christos Papadimitrou* Samantha Petti† Santosh Vempala†

June 16, 2016

Abstract

We study Boolean functions of an arbitrary number of input variables that can be realized by simple iterative constructions based on constant-size primitives. This restricted type of construction needs little global coordination or control and thus is a candidate for neurally feasible computation. Valiant's construction of a majority function can be realized in this manner and, as we show, can be generalized to any uniform threshold function. We study the rate of convergence, finding that while linear convergence to the correct function can be achieved for any threshold using a fixed set of primitives, for quadratic convergence, the size of the primitives must grow as the threshold approaches 0 or 1. We also study finite realizations of this process and the learnability of the functions realized. We show that the constructions realized are accurate outside a small interval near the target threshold, where the size of the construction grows as the inverse square of the interval width. This phenomenon, that errors are higher closer to thresholds (and thresholds closer to the boundary are harder to represent), is a well-known cognitive finding.

1 Introduction

Cortical computation. Among the many unexplained abilities of the cortex are learning complex patterns and invariants from relatively few examples. This is manifested in a range of cognitive functions including visual and auditory categorization, motor learning and language. In spite of the highly varied perceptual and cognitive tasks accomplished, the substrate appears to be relatively uniform in the distribution and type of cells. How could these 80 billion cells organize themselves so effectively?

Cortical computation must therefore be highly distributed, require little *synchrony* (number of pairs of events that must happen in lock-step across neurons), little *global control* (longest chain of events that must happen in sequence) and be based on very simple primitives [Papadimitriou and Vempala, 2015b]. Assuming that external stimuli are parsed as sets of binary sensory features, our central question is the following:

*UC Berkeley, christos@berkeley.edu, supported in part by NSF award CCF-1408635 and by Templeton Foundation grant 3966.

†Georgia Tech, {spetti3,vempala}@gatech.edu, supported in part by NSF awards CCF-1217793 and EAGER-1415498.

What functions can be represented and learned by algorithms so simple that one could imagine them happening in the cortex?

Perhaps the most natural primitives are the AND and OR functions on two input variables. These functions are arguably neurally plausible. They were studied as JOIN and LINK by Feldman and Valiant [2009], Valiant [1994, 2000, 2005], who showed how to implement them in the neuroidal model. An *item* is a collection of neurons (corresponding to a *neural assembly* in neuroscience) that represents some learned or sensed concept. Given two items A, B, the JOIN operation forms a new item $C = \text{JOIN}(A, B)$, which "fires" when both A and B fire, i.e., C represents $A \wedge B$. $\text{LINK}(A, B)$ captures association, and causes B to fire whenever A fires. By setting $\text{LINK}(A, C)$ and $\text{LINK}(B, C)$, we achieve that C is effectively $A \vee B$. While the precise implementation and neural correlates of JOIN and LINK are unclear, there is evidence that the brain routinely engages in hierarchical memory formation.

Monotone Boolean functions. Functions constructed by recursive processes based on AND/OR trees have been widely studied in the literature, motivated by the design of reliable circuits as in [Moore and Shannon, 1956] and more recently, understanding the complexity-theoretic limitations of monotone Boolean functions. One line of work studies the set of functions that could be the limits of recursive processes, where at each step, the leaves of a tree are each replaced by constant-size functions. Moore and Shannon [1956], showed that a simple recursive construction leads to a threshold function, which can be applied to construct stable circuits. Valiant [1984] used their 4-variable primitive function $(A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee D)$ to derive a small depth and size threshold function that evaluates to 1 if at least $(2 - \phi) \approx 0.38$ fraction of the inputs are set to 1 and to zero otherwise. The depth and size were $O(\log n)$ and $O(n^{5.3})$ respectively. Calling it the *amplification method*, Boppana [1985] showed that Valiant's construction is optimal. Dubiner and Zwick [1992] extended the lower bound to classes of read-once formulae. Hoory et al. [2006] gave smaller size Boolean *circuits* (where each gate can have fan out more than 1), of size $O(n^3)$ for the same threshold function. Luby et al. [1998] gave an alternative analysis of Valiant's construction along with applications to coding. The construction of a Boolean formula was extended by Servedio [2004] to monotone linear threshold functions, in that they can be approximated on most inputs by monotone Boolean formulae of polynomial size. Friedman [1986] gave more efficient constructions for threshold functions with small thresholds.

Savicky gives conditions under which the limit of such a process is the uniform distribution on all Boolean functions with n inputs [Savicky, 1987, 1990] (see also Brodsky and Pippenger [2005], Fournier et al. [2009]). In a different application, Goldman et al. [1993] showed how to use properties of these constructions to identify read-once formulae from their input-output behavior.

Our work. Unlike previous work, where a single constant-sized function is chosen and applied recursively, we will allow constructions that randomly choose one of two constant-sized functions. To be neurally plausible, our constructions are *bottom-up* rather than *top-down*, i.e., at each step, we apply a constant-size function to an existing set of outputs. In addition, the algorithm itself must be very simple — our goal is not to find ways to

realize all Boolean functions or to optimize the size of such realizations. Here we address the following questions: What functions of n input items can be constructed in this iterative manner? Can arbitrary uniform threshold functions be realized? What size and depth of iterative constructions suffices to guarantee accurate computations? Can such functions and constructions be learned from examples, where the learning algorithm is also neurally plausible?

Our rationale for uniform threshold functions is two-fold. First, uniform threshold functions are fundamental in computer science and likely also for cognition. Second, the restriction to JOIN and LINK as primitives ensures that any resulting function will be monotone since negation is not possible in this framework. Moreover, if we require the construction to be symmetric, it would seem that the only obtainable family of Boolean functions are uniform thresholds. However, as we will see, there is a surprise here, and in fact we can get *staircase functions*, i.e., functions that take value p_i on the interval (a_i, a_{i+1}) where $a_0 = 0 < a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_k < a_{k+1} = 1$ and $0 = p_0 < p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_{k-1} < p_k = 1$.

To be able to describe our results precisely, we begin with a definition of iterative constructions.

1.1 Iterative constructions

A sequence of AND/OR operations can be represented as a tree. Such a tree T with n leaves naturally computes a function $g_T : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$. We can build larger trees in a neurally plausible way by using a set of small AND/OR trees as building blocks. Let C be a probability distribution on a finite set of trees. We define an *iterative tree for* C as follows.

IterativeTree(L, m, C, X)**:**

For each level j from 1 to L, apply the following iteration m times:
(level 0 consists of the input items X)

1. Choose a tree T according to C.
2. Choose items at random from the items on level $j-1$.
3. Build the tree T with these items as leaves.

The construction of small AND/OR trees is a decentralized process requiring a short sequence of steps, i.e., the synchrony and control parameters are small. Therefore, we consider them to be neurally plausible.

The iterative tree construction has a well-defined sequence of *levels*, with items from the next level having leaves only in the current level. A construction that needs even less coordination is the following: the probability that an item participates in future item creation decays exponentially with time. The weight of an item starts at 1 when it is created and decays by a factor of $e^{-\alpha}$ each time unit. We refer to such constructions as *exponential* iterative constructions. An extreme version of this, which we call *wild* iterative construction, is to have $\alpha = 0$, i.e, all items are equally likely to participate in the creation of new items. Figure 1 illustrates these constructions.

ExponentialConstruction(k, C, α)**:**

Initialize the weights of input items to 1.
Construct k items as follows:

1. Choose a tree T according to C.
2. Choose the leafs for T independently from existing items with probability proportional to the weight of the item.
3. Build the tree T with these items as leaves.
4. Multiply the weight of every item by $e^{-\alpha}$.



Figure 1: Left: an iterative construction. Middle: a wild construction. Right: an exponential construction. In the latter two images, the thickness of the outline representing each item indicates the probability the item will be selected in the construction of the next item.

1.2 Results

We are interested in the functions computed by high-level items of iterative constructions. In particular, we design iterative constructions so that high-level items compute a threshold function with high probability.

Definition 1.1 The function $f : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ is a t-threshold if $f(x) = 0$ for $x < t$ and $f(x) = 1$ for $x > t$.

For given probability distribution on a set of trees, the output of high-level items of a corresponding iterative construction depends on the following: (i) the fraction of input items firing, (ii) the width of the levels, and (iii) the number of levels. For an n item input, the fraction of input items firing must take the form k/n, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Throughout the paper, we assume that the distance between the desired threshold and the fraction of input items firing is at least $1/n$. To address (ii), we first analyze the functions computed by high-level items of an iterative construction when the width of the levels is infinite, which is equivalent to the "top down" approach. Then in Section 5, we remove this assumption and analyze the "bottom-up" construction in which the items at level $j-1$ are fixed before the items at level j are created. The following theorems give a guarantee on the probability that an iterative tree with infinite width levels accurately computes a threshold function in terms of the number

of levels. To start, we restate Valiant's result [Valiant, 1984]. Here $\phi = (\sqrt{5}+1)/2$ is the golden ratio ($2-\phi \approx 0.38$).

Theorem 1.2 *Let R be the tree that computes $(A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee D)$. Then, an item at level $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ of an infinite width iteratively constructed tree for R computes a $(2-\phi)$-threshold function accurately with probability at least $1-2^{-k}$.*

In this construction, the iterative tree that computes the $2-\phi$ threshold function is built using only one small tree. We show that it is possible to achieve arbitrary threshold functions if we allow our iterative tree to be built according to a probability distribution on two distinct smaller trees.

Theorem 1.3 *Let $0 < t < 1$ and let $R = \{\mathsf{Pr}(T_1) = t, \mathsf{Pr}(T_2) = 1-t\}$ where T_1 is the tree that computes $(A \vee B) \wedge C$ and T_2 is the tree that computes $(A \wedge B) \vee C$. Then, an item at level $\Omega(\log n + k)$ of an infinite width iteratively constructed tree for R computes a t-threshold function accurately with probability at least $1-2^{-k}$.*

The rate of convergence of this more general construction is linear rather than quadratic. While both are interesting, the latter allows us to guarantee a correct function on every input with depth only $O(\log n)$, since there are 2^n possible inputs.

Definition 1.4 A construction exhibits *linear convergence* if items at level $\Omega(\log n + k)$ of an infinite width iterative tree accurately compute the threshold function with probability at least $1-2^{-k}$. A construction exhibits *quadratic convergence* if items at level $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ of an infinite width iterative tree accurately compute the threshold function with probability at least $1-2^{-k}$.

The next theorem gives constructions using slightly larger trees with 4 and 5 leaves respectively (illustrated in Figure 2) that converge quadratically to a t-threshold function for a range of values of t, with more leaves giving a larger range. Moreover, these ranges are tight, i.e. no construction on trees with 4 or 5 leaves yields quadratic convergence to a t-threshold function for t outside these ranges.

Theorem 1.5 *(A) Let $2-\phi \leq t \leq \phi - 1$ and $\alpha(t) = \frac{1-t-t^2}{2t(t-1)}$. Let $R = \{\mathsf{Pr}(F_1) = \alpha(t), \mathsf{Pr}(F_2) = 1-\alpha(t)\}$ be the probably distribution on trees in Figure 2. Then, an item at level $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ of an infinite width iteratively constructed tree for R computes a t-threshold function accurately with probability at least $1-2^{-k}$. Moreover, for t outside this range, there exists no such construction on trees with four leaves that converge quadratically to a t-threshold function.*

(B) Let $\alpha(t) = \frac{-1+5t-4t^2+t^3}{5t(t-1)}$ and let t be a value for which $0 \leq \alpha(t) \leq 1$, so $0.26 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.74$. Let $R = \{\mathsf{Pr}(V_1) = \alpha(t), \mathsf{Pr}(V_2) = 1-\alpha(t)\}$ be the probably distribution on trees in Figure 2. Then, an item at level $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ of an infinite width iteratively constructed tree for R computes a t-threshold function accurately with probability at least $1-2^{-k}$. Moreover, for t outside this range, there exists no such construction on trees with five leaves that converges quadratically to a t-threshold function.



Figure 2: For $.38 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.62$, there exists a probability distribution on F_1 and F_2 that yields an iterative tree that converges quadratically to a t-threshold function. For $.26 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.74$, there exists a probability distribution on V_1 and V_2 that yields an iterative tree that converges quadratically to a t-threshold function.

As the desired threshold t approaches 0 or 1, we show that an iterative tree that computes the t-threshold function must use increasingly large trees as building blocks.

Theorem 1.6 *Let t be a threshold, $0 < t < 1$ and let $s = \min\{t, 1-t\}$. Then, the construction of an iterative tree whose level $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ items compute a t-threshold function with probability at least $1 - 2^{-k}$ must be defined over a probability distribution on trees with at least $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2s}}$ leaves.*

This raises the question of whether it is possible to have quadratic convergence for any threshold. We can extend the constructions described in Theorem 1.5 by using analogous trees with six and seven leaves to obtain quadratic convergence for thresholds in the ranges $0.15 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.85$ and $0.11 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.89$ respectively. However, it is not possible to generalize this construction beyond this point, as we discuss in Section 4. Instead, to achieve quadratic convergence for thresholds near the boundaries, we turn to the following construction, which asymptotically matches the lower bound of Theorem 1.6. We define A_k as a tree on $2k$ leaves that computes $(x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \cdots \vee x_k) \wedge (x_{k+1} \vee x_{k+2} \vee \cdots \vee x_{2k})$ and B_k as a tree on $2k$ leaves that computes $(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_k) \vee (x_{k+1} \wedge x_{k+2} \wedge \cdots \wedge x_{2k})$.

Theorem 1.7 *For any $0 < t \leq 2 - \phi$, there exists k and a probability distribution on A_k and A_{k+1} that yields an iterative tree with quadratic convergence to a t-threshold function. Similarly for any $\phi - 1 \leq t < 1$, there exists k and a probability distribution on B_k and B_{k+1} that yields an iterative tree with quadratic convergence to a t-threshold function.*

There is a trade-off between constructing iterative trees that converge faster and requiring minimal coordination in order to build the subtrees. Building a specified tree on a small number of leaves requires less coordination than building a specified tree on many leaves. Therefore, as t approaches 0 or 1, constructing an iterative tree with quadratic convergence becomes less neurally plausible because the construction of each subtree requires much coordination. These results are in line with behavioral findings [Rosch, 1978, Rosch et al.,

1976] and computational models [Arriaga and Vempala, 2006, Arriaga et al., 2015] about categorization being easier when concepts are more robust.

In Section 4, we characterize the class of functions that can be achieved by iterative constructions allowing building block trees of any size. We show that it is possible to achieve an arbitrarily close approximation of any staircase function in which each step intersects the line $y = x$. This result is described more precisely in Theorem 4.10.

In the following section we turn to finite realizations of iterative trees. The above theorems analyze the behavior of an iterative construction where the width of the levels is infinite. We assumed that for any input the number of items turned on at given level of the tree is equal to its expectation. Imagining a "bottom up" construction, we note that the chance that the number of items firing at a given level deviates from expectation is non-trivial. Such deviations percolate up the tree and effect the probability that high-level items compute the threshold function accurately. The smaller the width of a level, the more likely that the number of items on at that level deviates significantly from expectation, rendering the tree less accurate. How large do the levels of an iteratively constructed tree need to be in order to ensure a reasonable degree of accuracy?

Theorem 1.8 *Consider a construction of a t-threshold function with quadratic convergence described in Theorem 1.5 or Theorem 1.7 in which each level ℓ has m_ℓ items and the fraction of input items firing is at least ε from the threshold t. Then, with probability at least $1-\gamma$, items at level $\Omega\left(\log\frac{1}{\gamma}+\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)$ will accurately compute the threshold function for $m_1 = \Omega\left(\frac{\ln(1/\gamma)}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ and $\sum_\ell m_\ell = O(m_1)$.*

As a direct corollary, by setting $\varepsilon = O(1/n)$ and $\gamma = 2^{-n-1}$, we realize a t-threshold construction of size $O(n^3)$ for any t, matching the best-known construction which was for a specific threshold [Hoory et al., 2006]. The finite-width version of Theorem 1.3 is given in Section 5.

The exponential iterative construction also converges to a t-threshold function for appropriate α. We give the statements here for the wild iterative construction (with no weight decay) and the general exponential construction.

Theorem 1.9 *Consider a wild construction on n inputs for the t-threshold function given in Theorem 1.3 in which $n > \log(\frac{1}{8\varepsilon\delta})\max\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2},\frac{1}{\delta^2}\}$ where ε is the distance between t and the fraction of inputs firing. Then, there is an absolute constant c such that for $k = \Omega\left(n\left(\frac{1}{\delta^c}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^c}\right)\right)$, the k^{th} item accurately computes the t-threshold function with probability at least $1-\delta$.*

Theorem 1.10 *Consider an exponential construction on n inputs for the t-threshold function given in Theorem 1.3 in which $\alpha = \lfloor\frac{\min\{\varepsilon^2,\delta^2\}}{2048e^4\log(4/\varepsilon\delta)}\rfloor$ and $n > 1/\alpha$. Then for*

$$k = \Omega\left(\frac{\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta}}{\min\{\varepsilon^2,\delta^2\}}\left(\log\frac{n}{\varepsilon\delta}\right)\right),$$

with probability at least $1-\delta$, the k^{th} item will compute the t-threshold function.

Finally, in Section 6, we give a simple cortical algorithm to learn a uniform threshold function from a single example, described more precisely by the following theorem.

Theorem 1.11 *Let $X \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $||X||_1 = tn$, $L = \Omega\left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)$, and $\varepsilon = \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\ln(1/\gamma)}{m}}\right)$. Then, on any input in which the fraction of input items firing is outside $[t-\varepsilon, t+\varepsilon]$, items at level L of an iterative tree produced by LearnThreshold(L, m, X) will compute a t-threshold function with probability at least $1-\gamma$.*

The next section provides the groundwork for these theorems, and the proofs are in Sections 3, 4, 5, 6. We discuss several open questions and directions for future research in Section 7.

2 Polynomials of AND/OR Trees

Let $g_T : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be the Boolean function computed by an AND/OR tree T with n leaves. We define f_T as the probability that T evaluates to 1 if each input item is independently set to 1 with probability p.

$$f_T(p) = \mathsf{Pr}\left(g_T(X) = 1 \,|\, X \sim B(n,p)\right).$$

We analogously define $f_C(p)$ for probability distributions on trees; let f_C be the probability that a tree chosen according to C evaluates to 1 if each input item is independently set to 1 with probability p. Let λ_T be the probability of T in distribution C. We have

$$f_C(p) = \sum_{T \in C} \lambda_T f_T(p).$$

In an iterative construction for the probability distribution C, an item at level k evaluates to 1 with probability $f_C(p_{k-1})$ where p_{k-1} is the probability that an item at level $k-1$ evaluates to 1. In the case where the width of the levels is infinite, the fraction of inputs firing any level is exactly equal its expectation. Therefore, the probability that items at level k evaluate to 1 is $f_C^{(k)}(p)$ where p is the probability an input is set to 1. This follows directly from the recurrence relation:

$$f_C^{(k)}(p) = f_C(f_C^{(k-1)}(p)).$$

In the remainder of this section, we collect properties of polynomials of AND/OR trees to be used in the analysis of iterative trees.

We call a polynomial *achievable* if it can be written as f_T for some AND/OR tree T. We call a polynomial *achievable through convex combinations* if it can be written as f_C for some probability distribution on AND/OR trees C. Table 1 lists all achievable polynomials with degree at most five. Note that $\mathcal{A}$ is closed under the AND and OR operations. If $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, then $a \cdot b \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a + b - a \cdot b \in \mathcal{A}$. The set of polynomials achievable through convex combinations is the convex hull of $\mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of achievable polynomials. Let $A(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_n x^n$ be a polynomial in $\mathcal{A}$. Then,*

1. $a_0 = 0$

2. $a_n = -1$ *or* 1

3. $\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i = 1$

4. *If $A(x)$ has degree d, then $A(x)$ is the polynomial for a tree on d leaves.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the degree of $A(x)$. For $d = 1$, $A(x) = x$ is the only polynomial in $\mathcal{A}$ and all the above properties hold. Next assume all the properties hold for polynomials of degree less than d. Let $A(x)$ be an achievable polynomial of degree d. Then the root of the tree for A, which we call T_A, is either an AND or an OR operation. In the former case, $A = B \cdot C$ and in the latter case $A = B + C - B \cdot C$ where $B, C \in \mathcal{A}$ and B has degree k and C has degree $d - k$ for $0 < k < d$. In either case, the first three properties follow trivially from the inductive hypothesis. For item (4), let T_B and T_C be trees that correspond to B and C respectively. Then T_B and T_C have k and $d - k$ leaves respectively. Since T_A is T_B adjoined with T_C with an AND or OR operation, T_A has d leaves. □

Lemma 2.2 *Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ be an achievable polynomial of degree d, $f = a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + \ldots a_d x^d$. Then $|a_\ell| \leq d^\ell$.*

Proof. Proceed by induction. The only achievable polynomial of degree 1 is $f(x) = x$, so the statement clearly holds. Next, assume $|a_{\ell'}| \leq d^{\ell'}$ holds for all $l' < l$. Let f be a degree d achievable polynomial. We may assume $f = g + h - gh$ or $f = gh$ where g and h are achievable polynomials with degree k and $d - k$ respectively where $k \leq \frac{\ell}{2}$. First consider the case when $f = g + h - gh$, meaning the root of the tree corresponding to f is an OR operation. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} |a_\ell(f)| &= \left|a_\ell(g) + a_\ell(h) - \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} a_i(g) a_{l-i}(h)\right| \\ &\leq k^\ell + (d-k)^\ell + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} k^i (d-k)^{l-i} \\ &\leq ((d-k)+k)^\ell \\ &= d^\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Next consider the case when $f = gh$, meaning the root of the tree corresponding to f is an AND operation. Observe that

$$|a_\ell(f)| = \left|\sum_{i=1}^{l-1} a_i(g) a_{l-i}(h)\right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} k^i (d-k)^{l-i} < d^\ell.$$

□

We observe a relationship between the polynomial of a tree and the polynomial of its complement. We define the complement of the AND/OR tree T to be the tree obtained from T by switching the operation at each node.

Lemma 2.3 *Let A and B be complementary AND/OR trees and let f_A and f_B be the corresponding polynomials. Then $f_B(1-p) = 1 - f_A(p)$ for all $0 < p < 1$.*

Proof. Proceed by induction on the number of leaves of the tree. For a tree on one leaf, the statement holds trivially. Without loss of generality, assume that the root of tree A is an AND operation. Then $f_A(x) = a_1(x)a_2(x)$ and $f_B(x) = b_1(x) + b_2(x) - b_1(x)b_2(x)$ where the trees corresponding to a_1 and b_1 are complements and the trees corresponding to a_2 and b_2 are also complements. By the inductive hypothesis, $a_1(p) = 1 - b_1(1-p)$ and $a_2(p) = 1 - b_2(1-p)$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - f_A(p) &= 1 - a_1(p)a_2(p) \\ &= 1 - (1 - b_1(1-p))(1 - b_2(1-p)) \\ &= b_1(1-p) + b_2(1-p) - b_1(1-p)b_2(1-p) \\ &= f_B(1-p). \end{aligned}$$

□

Let f_A be a polynomial achievable through convex combinations, $f_A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i f_{A_i}$. Let A_i and B_i be complementary AND/OR trees. Let $f_B = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i f_{B_i}$. We say that f_A and f_B are *complementary polynomials*.

Corollary 2.4 *Let f_A and f_B be complementary polynomials. Then*

1. *For all $0 < p < 1$, $f_B(1-p) = 1 - f_A(p)$*
2. *If p is a fixed point of f_A then $1-p$ is a fixed point of f_B*
3. *For all $0 < p < 1$, $f_B^{(k)}(1-p) = 1 - f_A^{(k)}(p)$.*

Definition 2.5 We say that t in an *attractive* fixed point of f if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $x \in [0,1]$ such that $|x - t| < \varepsilon$, $|t - f(f(x))| < |t - f(x)|$. We say that t in a *non-attractive* fixed point of f if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $x \in [0,1]$ such that $|x - t| < \varepsilon$, $|t - f(f(x))| > |t - f(x)|$. Equivalently, t is a non-attractive fixed point if $f'(t) > 1$, and an attractive fixed point if $f'(t) < 1$.

For the function illustrated in Figure 3, 0 and 1 are attractive fixed points and 1/2 is a non-attractive fixed point. For the function illustrated in Figure 4, 0 and 1 are non-attractive fixed points and 1/2 is an attractive fixed point.

Lemma 2.6 *Let $f \in \mathcal{A}$ be an achievable polynomial corresponding to a tree T with at least one AND or OR operation. Then*

1. *The function f has an attractive fixed point at 0, a non-attractive fixed point at 1, and no fixed points in $(0,1)$ if and only if there is a path from the root to a leaf in T in which each node represents an AND operation.*
2. *The function f has an non-attractive fixed point at 0, an attractive fixed point at 1, and no fixed points in $(0,1)$ if and only if there is a path from the root to a leaf in T in which each node represents an OR operation.*

3. *The function f has attractive fixed points at 0 and 1, and precisely one non-attractive fixed point α in $(0,1)$ if and only if there is no path from the root to a leaf in T in which each node represents an AND operation and there is no path from the root to a leaf in T in which each node represents an OR operation. Moreover, α is irrational.*

[Moore and Shannon, 1956] prove a stronger version of (3). They show that any polynomial f corresponding to an arbitrary circuit of AND and OR operations can have at most one fixed point on $(0,1)$. We present a similar version of their argument for the setting when f is corresponds to a tree.

Proof. It suffices to prove necessity for each statement.

(1) Let $p^2 = a_1, \ldots, a_k = f$ be the polynomials computed by the nodes of some AND path. Since each a_i corresponds to a tree with an AND root, $a_i = a_{i-1}g_i$ where g_i is the polynomial corresponding to the subtree of the node that does not intersect that AND path. Thus, $f = a_k = p^2 \prod_{i=2}^{k} g_i$. For $0 < p < 1$,

$$\frac{f(p)}{p} = p \prod_{i=2}^{k} g_i(p) < p < 1.$$

Therefore, f has no fixed points on $(0,1)$. To see that 0 is an attractive fixed point, note that $f(p) < p$ for any $p \in (0,1)$, Thus, $f(f(p)) < f(p)$. Similarly, 1 is a non-attractive fixed point because $1 - f(f(p)) > 1 - f(p)$ for all $p \in (0,1)$.

(2) Follows from (1) and Lemma 2.3.

(3) First we show that if the tree has no path of OR operations, then the corresponding polynomial f will not have a linear term by proving the contrapositive. The root of a tree corresponding to a polynomial with a linear term must be an OR operation since if the root were an AND operation, the corresponding polynomial would the product of two non-zero polynomials with no constant terms. Given that the root has a linear term and computes $g + h - gh$ for some achievable polynomials g and h, it follows that g or h has a linear term. We iteratively apply this argument for the appropriate subtrees and conclude that there is a path of OR operations.

Since f has no linear term, for small ε, $f(\varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon^2)$. Therefore, there is an ε neighborhood around zero such that $f(p) < p$. It follows that $f(f(p)) < f(p)$, so 0 is an attractive fixed point. The fact that 1 is also an attractive fixed point follows from Lemma 2.3. Since there is no AND path for T, there is no OR path in the complementary tree. Thus, 0 is an attractive fixed point of f^c, so 1 is an attractive fixed point of f.

Next, we show that there exists some fixed point of f on $(0,1)$. Since 0 and 1 are attractive fixed points, there exists $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that $f(\varepsilon_1) < \varepsilon_1$ and $f(1-\varepsilon_2) > 1 - \varepsilon_2$. By the intermediate value theorem, f must cross the line $y = x$. Thus, there exists some $\alpha \in (\varepsilon_1, 1-\varepsilon_2) \subset (0,1)$ such that $f(\alpha) = \alpha$.

To prove that α is a non-attractive fixed point and that α is the unique fixed point on $(0,1)$, it suffices to show that for any fixed point $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $f'(\alpha) \geq 1$. We use an argument inspired by [Moore and Shannon, 1956] to prove $f'(p) \geq \frac{f(p)(1-f(p))}{p(1-p)}$ for $p \in (0,1)$. Proceed by induction on the size of the tree. Clearly, the statement holds for the leaves which compute

the polynomial p. Let g, h be the polynomials associated to the two subtrees joined at the root of T. If the root is an AND operation, $f = gh$, and we have

$$f' = gh' + g'h \geq \frac{gh(1-h)}{p(1-p)} + \frac{hg(1-g)}{p(1-p)} = \frac{gh(2-g-h)}{p(1-p)} \geq \frac{gh(1-gh)}{p(1-p)} = \frac{f(1-f)}{p(1-p)}.$$

The final inequality uses the fact that since $(1-g)(1-h) \geq 0$, $2-g-h \geq 1-gh$. If the root is an OR operation, $f = g + h - gh$ and we have

$$f' = g' + h' - gh' - g'h = h'(1-g) + g'(1-h) \geq \frac{h(1-h)(1-g) + g(1-g)(1-h)}{p(1-p)}$$

$$= \frac{(1-h-g+gh)(g+h)}{p(1-p)} \geq \frac{(1-h-g+gh)(g+h-gh)}{p(1-p)} = \frac{f(1-f)}{p(1-p)}.$$

Finally, we prove that α is irrational. Suppose for contradiction that $\alpha = m/n$ where $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and are relatively prime. Let $k+3$ be the degree of f. We may write

$$f(p) = g(p)(1-p)\left(p - \frac{m}{n}\right)p = \sum_{i=0}^{k} a_i p^{i+1}\left(-p^2 + \left(1 + \frac{m}{n}\right)p - \frac{m}{n}\right),$$

where $g(p) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} a_i p^i$ and $a_k \neq 0$. Let b_i be the coefficient of the term p^i in f. Since f is achievable, by Lemma 2.1, each $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b_0 = 0$, and b_{k+3} is 1 or -1. We show by induction that for all i $a_i = nt_i$ for some $t_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. First note that $b_1 = \frac{-m}{n}a_0$. Since $b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a_0 = nt_0$ where $t_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Similarly, $b_2 = \left(1 + \frac{m}{n}\right)a_0 + \left(\frac{-m}{n}\right)a_1$, so $a_1 = nt_1$ for some $t_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. We have $b_3 = -a_0 + \left(1 + \frac{m}{n}\right)a_1 + \left(\frac{-m}{n}\right)a_2$, so $a_2 = nt_2$ for some $t_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that $a_\ell = nt_\ell$ for all $\ell < j-1$. We have

$$b_j = -a_{j-3} + \left(1 + \frac{m}{n}\right)a_{j-2} + \left(\frac{-m}{n}\right)a_{j-1}.$$

Since a_{j-3} and a_{j-2} are integer multiples of n, it follows that $-a_{j-3} + \left(1 + \frac{m}{n}\right)a_{j-2}$ is integer. Since b_j is integer, $a_{j-1} = t_{j-1}n$ for some $t_{j-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. We have shown that $a_0, \ldots a_k$ are integer multiples of n. We have $b_{k+3} = -a_k$. Since a_k is a non-zero integer multiple of n, it follows that b_{k+3} is not -1 or 1, a contradiction. □

Finally, we make some observations about the polynomials associated with the specific family of trees we use in many of our constructions.

Definition 2.7 Let A_k be a tree on $2k$ leaves that computes $(x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \cdots \vee x_k) \wedge (x_{k+1} \vee x_{k+2} \vee \cdots \vee x_{2k})$. Let B_k be a tree on $2k$ leaves that computes $(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_k) \vee (x_{k+1} \wedge x_{k+2} \wedge \cdots \wedge x_{2k})$.

Lemma 2.8 *Let f_{A_k} and f_{B_k} be the polynomials corresponding to A_k and B_k respectively. Then f_{A_k} has a unique fixed point in the interval $\left(\frac{1}{k^2}, \frac{1}{k(k-1)}\right)$ and f_{B_k} has a fixed point in the interval $\left(1 - \frac{1}{k(k-1)}, 1 - \frac{1}{k^2}\right)$.*

The proof of Lemma 2.8 will use the following elementary inequality.

Lemma 2.9 *For $x \in (0,1)$, and any integer $k \geq 0$, $1 - kx < (1-x)^k < 1 - kx + \binom{k}{2}x^2$.*

Proof.[of Lemma 2.8.] It suffices to show that $g(x) = f_{A_k}(x) - x$ has a zero on the interval $\left(\frac{1}{k^2}, \frac{1}{k(k-1)}\right)$. We will show that $g(1/k^2) < 0$ and $g(1/(k(k-1))) > 0$ and apply the intermediate value theorem. Using Lemma 2.9, for $x = 1/k^2$,

$$(1-(1-x)^k)^2 - x < (1-(1-kx))^2 - x = k^2x^2 - x = 0.$$

Similarly, for $x = 1/(k(k-1))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-(1-x)^k)^2 - x &> \left(1 - \left(1 - kx + \frac{k(k-1)x^2}{2}\right)\right)^2 - x \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{k-1} - \frac{1}{2k(k-1)}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{k(k-1)} \\
&= \frac{1}{(k-1)^2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2k}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{k(k-1)} \\
&= \frac{1}{(k-1)^2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{4k^2} - (1 - \frac{1}{k})\right) = \frac{1}{4k^2(k-1)^2} > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Corollary 2.4 that f_{B_k} has a fixed point in the interval $\left(1 - \frac{1}{k(k-1)}, 1 - \frac{1}{k^2}\right)$. Uniqueness follows from Lemma 2.10. □

Lemma 2.10 *Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and $f = \alpha f_{B_k} + (1-\alpha) f_{B_{k+1}}$ where f_{B_k} is the polynomial corresponding to B_k. Let t be the fixed point of f in $(0,1)$. Then $g(p) = \frac{f(p)-p}{p(1-p)(p-t)} \geq \frac{1}{t}$ for all $p \in [0,1]$.*

Proof. By definition

$$g(p) = \frac{f(p)-p}{p(1-p)(p-t)} = \frac{\alpha(1 - 2p^{k-1} + p^{2k-1}) + (1-\alpha)(1 - 2p^k + p^{2k+1})}{(1-p)(t-p)}.$$

Since 1 and t are fixed points of $f(p)$, $(1-p)$ and $(t-p)$ divide $f(p) - p$. Therefore, we may write $g = a_0 + a_1 p \cdots + a_{2k-1}p^{2k-1}$ polynomial. We claim that all coefficients of g are positive. Note that

$$(t-p)\sum_{i=0}^{2k-1} a_i p^i =$$
$$\alpha(1 + p \cdots + p^{k-2} - p^{k-1} - p^k \cdots - p^{2k-2}) + (1-\alpha)(1 + p \cdots + p^{k-1} - p^k - p^{k+1} \cdots - p^{2k}).$$

Observe

$$\begin{aligned}
a_i &= \frac{1}{t} && \text{for } i = 0 \\
a_i &= \frac{a_{i-1}+1}{t} && \text{for } 1 \le i \le k-2 \\
a_i &= \frac{a_{i-1}+1-2\alpha}{t} && \text{for } i = k-1 \\
a_i &= \frac{a_{i-1}-1}{t} && \text{for } k \le i \le 2k-2 \\
a_i &= \frac{a_{i-1}-(1-\alpha)}{t} && \text{for } i = 2k-1.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\frac{1}{t} = a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_{k-2}$, so $a_i > 0$ for all $0 \le i \le k-2$. Next observe that $a_{2k-1} = 1-\alpha$ since comparing the coefficients of the p^{2k} terms on both sides gives $-a_{2k-1} = -(1-\alpha)$. It follows that $a_{2k-2} = t(1-\alpha)+1-\alpha$. For all $k \le i \le 2k-2$, $a_{i-1} = ta_i + 1$. Therefore $a_i > 0$ for all $k-1 \le i \le 2k-3$.

Since all coefficients of g are positive, all derivatives are increasing. In particular the first derivative of $g(p)$ is increasing on the interval $(0,1)$. Therefore $g(p) \ge g(0) = \frac{1}{t}$ for all $p \in [0,1]$. □

Lemma 2.11 *Let f_{A_k} and f_{B_k} be the polynomials corresponding to A_k and B_k respectively. For $t \le 2-\phi$, there exists some k and α such that $f_A = \alpha f_{A_k} + (1-\alpha) f_{A_{k+1}}$ has fixed point t. Moreover, $\frac{t-f_A(p)}{t-p} \ge \left(1 + \frac{p(1-p)}{t}\right)$. Similarly, for $t \ge \phi - 1$, there exists some k and α such that $f_B = \alpha f_{B_k} + (1-\alpha) f_{B_{k+1}}$ has fixed point t. Moreover, $\frac{t-f_B(p)}{t-p} \ge \left(1 + \frac{p(1-p)}{t}\right)$.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.4, it suffices to prove the theorem for $\phi - 1 \le t < 1$. By Lemma 2.8, f_{B_k} has a single fixed point in the range $\left(1 - \frac{1}{k(k-1)}, 1 - \frac{1}{k^2}\right)$. Let b_k be the fixed point f_{B_k}. Note that for $0 < p < 1$,

$$f_{B_{k+1}}(p) < f_{B_k}(p).$$

It follows that $b_k < b_{k+1}$. We obtain an increasing sequence $\phi - 1 = b_2, b_3, b_4 \ldots$ that converges to 1. Let k be the value for which $b_k \le t < b_{k+1}$. Let $f = \alpha f_{B_k} + (1-\alpha) f_{B_{k+1}}$ where α is chosen so that f has fixed point t.

Next we show that $t - f(p) \ge (t-p)\left(1 + \frac{p(1-p)}{t}\right)$. By Lemma 2.10, $g(p) = \frac{f(p)-p}{p(1-p)(p-t)} \ge \frac{1}{t}$ for $0 \le p \le 1$. Therefore

$$t - f(p) = (t-p)(1 + p(1-p)g(p)) \ge (t-p)\left(1 + \frac{p(1-p)}{t}\right).$$

□

3 Convergence of iterative trees to threshold functions

In the previous section, we showed that if the width of each level is infinite, then items at level k of an iterative tree evaluate to 1 with probability $f_C^{(k)}(p)$ when each input is independently set to 1 with probability p. In this section, we demonstrate ways of selecting C so that $f_C^{(k)}(p)$ converges to a t-threshold function.

By an abuse of notation, we say that $f(p)$ converges to a t-threshold function if

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} f^{(k)}(p) = \begin{cases} 0 & 0 \le p < t \\ 1 & t < p \le 1 \\ p & p = t. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we say that f converges quadratically to a t-threshold function if the corresponding iterative construction exhibits quadratic convergence. The function depicted in Figure 3 converges to a 1/2-threshold function.



Figure 3: A function f that converges to a 1/2-threshold function. Left to right: $f(p), f^{(5)}(p), f^{(10)}(p), f^{(30)}(p)$.

We now prove that the construction described in Theorem 1.3 converges to a t-threshold function.

Proof. [of Theorem 1.3.] Let f_R be the polynomial that describes the iterative construction in which T_1 and T_2 are selected with probability t and $1-t$ respectively. Since, $f_{T_1}(p) = 2p^2 - p^3$ and $f_{T_2}(p) = p + p^2 - p^3$,

$$f_R(p) = t f_{T_1}(p) + (1-t) f_{T_2}(p) = (1-t)p + (1+t)p^2 - p^3.$$

Since $f_R(p) - p = p(1-p)(p-t)$, the fixed points of f_R are $0, t$, and 1. We claim that f_R exhibits linear convergence to a t-threshold function.

Let p be the probability that an input item fires. It suffices to consider the case when $p \le t - 1/n$. By Corollary 2.4, convergence to 1 for $p \ge t + \frac{1}{n}$ follows from the complementary construction.

First we show that the probability an item at level $\Omega(\log n)$ fires is less than $\frac{t}{2}$. By definition $p - f(p) = p(1-p)(t-p)$. Observe that for $t/2 < p \le t - 1/n$

$$\frac{t - f(p)}{t - p} = 1 + \frac{p - f(p)}{t - p} = 1 + p(1-t) \ge 1 + \frac{t(1-t)}{2}.$$

It follows that for all ℓ either $f^{(\ell)}(p) < \frac{t}{2}$ or

$$t - f^{(\ell)}(p) \geq \left(1 + \frac{t(1-t)}{2}\right)^{\ell} (t-p) \geq \left(1 + \frac{t(1-t)}{2}\right)^{\ell} \frac{1}{n}.$$

For $\ell = \log_{1+\frac{t(1-t)}{2}} \frac{tn}{2}$, $f^{\ell}(p) < \frac{t}{2}$.

Next, we show that at $\Omega(k)$ additional levels, the probability an items fires is less than 2^{-k}. For $p < \frac{t}{2}$,

$$f(p) = p(1-p)(p-t) + p = p(1-(1-p)(t-p)) \leq p\left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{t}{2}\right)\frac{t}{2}\right).$$

It follows

$$f^{(l)}(p) < \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{t}{2}\right)\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\ell} p < \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{t}{2}\right)\frac{t}{2}\right)^{\ell} \frac{t}{2}.$$

Thus, for $l = \log_{\left(1-\left(1-\frac{t}{2}\right)\frac{t}{2}\right)} \frac{1}{t2^{k-1}}$, $f^{\ell}(p) < 2^{-k}$. We have shown that when the input items fire with probability $p \leq t - 1/n$, items level $\Omega(k + \log n)$ will evaluate to 1 with probability less than 2^{-k}. □

3.1 Quadratic convergence from iterative trees with small building blocks

In this section we show that using trees with four or five leaves as building blocks, we can construct an iterative tree that converges quadratically to a t-threshold function for restricted values of t. We begin with a lemma that provides sufficient conditions for quadratic convergence.

Lemma 3.1 *Let f be a function corresponding to an iterative construction on n inputs that satisfies the following conditions:*

- *On the interval $[0,1]$, f has precisely three fixed points: $0, t$, and 1.*
- *(Linear Divergence) There exists constants u, v satisfying $0 < u < t$ and $t < v < 1$ and constants $c_1, c_2 > 1$ such that*
  1. *$t - f(p) \geq c_1(t-p)$ for $p \in [u, t - \frac{1}{n}]$, and*
  2. *$f(p) - t \geq c_2(p-t)$ for $p \in [t + \frac{1}{n}, v]$.*
- *(Quadratic Convergence) For the constants u, v as above, there exists constants c_3, c_4 such that $c_3 u < 1$ and $c_4(1-v) < 1$ and*
  1. *$f(p) < c_3 p^2$ for $p \in (0, u)$, and*
  2. *$1 - f(p) < c_4(1-p)^2$ for $p \in (v, 1)$.*

Then f exhibits quadratic convergence to a t-threshold function, meaning items at level $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ of the corresponding infinite width iterative construction compute a t-threshold function with probability at least $1 - 2^{-k}$.

Proof. Let p be the probability an input item fires. First we consider the case when $p \leq t - \frac{1}{n}$. By the linear divergence assumption, $t - f(p) \geq c_1(t-p)$ for $p \in [u, t - \frac{1}{n}]$. It follows that $f^{(\ell)}(p) < u$ or

$$t - f^{(\ell)}(p) \geq c_1^{\ell}(t-p) \geq c_1^{\ell}(1/n).$$

Thus for $\ell = \log_{c_1} n(t-u)$, $f^{(\ell)}(p) \leq u$. Therefore, level $\Omega(\log n)$ items fire with probability at most u. Next we show that given a level in which items fire with probability at most u, the items at $\Omega(\log k)$ levels higher in the iterative tree fire with probability at most 2^{-k}. Let p' be the probability an item fires at the first level for which the probability an item fires is below u. By the quadratic convergence assumption, $f(p') < c_3(p')^2$ for $p' \in (0, u)$. It follows that for $\ell > \log_2(\log_{c_3}(1/2)) + \log_2(k) - \log_2(1 + \log_{c_3}(t - 1/n)) + 1$, $f^{(\ell)}(p') \leq c^{2^{\ell}-1}(p')^{2^{\ell}} \leq c^{2^{\ell}-1}u^{2^{\ell}} < 2^{-k}$. We have shown that in expectation items at $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ fire with probability less than 2^{-k} when $p \leq t - \frac{1}{n}$. A similar argument applies for $p \geq t + \frac{1}{n}$. □

Remark 3.2 Let f be a function corresponding to an iterative construction with fixed point t. Then there exists u and v for which the quadratic convergence condition of Lemma 3.1 holds if and only if $f'(0) = 0$ and $f'(1) = 0$.

Proof. Quadratic convergence to 0 is observed if and only if there exists some positive constant u sufficiently close to 0 for which all $x < u$, $f(x) = O(x^2)$. Writing $f(x)$ according to its Taylor series expansion about 0 implies that such behavior occurs if and only if $f'(0) = 0$. Similarly, the observing the Taylor series expansion about 1 allows us to conclude that quadratic convergence to 1 is observed if and only if $f'(1) = 0$. □

Next, we prove that the construction given in Theorem 1.5A converges quadratically to a t- threshold function.

Proof. [of Theorem 1.5A.] Since $2 - \phi \leq t \leq \phi - 1$, $0 \leq \alpha(t) \leq 1$ and the probability distribution R is well-defined. By construction, $f_{F_1}(p) = 4p^2 - 4p^3 + p^4$ and $f_{F_2}(p) = 2p^2 - p^4$, so

$$f_R(p) = \frac{1 + t - 3t^2}{t(1-t)}p^2 + \frac{-2 + 2t + 2t^2}{t(1-t)}p^3 + \frac{1 - 2t}{t(1-t)}p^4.$$

We apply Lemma 3.1. First note that $0, t$, and 1 are fixed points. Let p be the fraction of input items firing. It suffices to show convergence to 0 when $p \leq t - \frac{1}{n}$. By Corollary 2.4, convergence to 1 for $p \geq t + \frac{1}{n}$ follows from the complementary construction.

First we show linear divergence from t. Let $g(p) = \frac{f(p)-p}{p(1-p)(p-t)} = \frac{1}{t} + \frac{p(2t-1)}{(1-t)t}$. We claim $g(p) \geq 1$ for $0 \leq p \leq 1$. If $t \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then $g(p) \geq \frac{1}{t} > 1$. If $t < \frac{1}{2}$, then $g(p) \geq \frac{1}{t} + \frac{2t-1}{(1-t)t} = \frac{1}{1-t} \geq 1$. Observe that for any constant $0 < u < t$ and $u < p \leq t - 1/n$

$$t - f(p) = t - (p + p(1-p)(p-t)g(p)) \geq (t-p)\left(1 + p(1-p)\right) \geq (t-p)\left(1 + u(1-t)\right).$$

Thus $c_1 = 1 + u(1-t)$ satisfies the first linear divergence condition.

Next, we show quadratic convergence. Let $u = 1/5$. Observe that

$$f(p) \leq 4p^2 - 4p^3 + p^4 < 4p^2.$$

Since $(1/5)4 < 1$, taking $c_3 = 4$ satisfies the first condition of quadratic convergence. Thus, we may apply Lemma 3.1 to conclude that items at level $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ in the limit of the iterative construction compute a t-threshold function with probability at least $1 - 2^{-k}$.

It remains to show that no construction using trees with four leaves will yield quadratic convergence to a t-threshold function for t outside the range $2-\phi \leq t \leq \phi - 1$. A t-threshold function with quadratic convergence must satisfy the following five constraints: (i) $f(0) = 0$, (ii) $f(1) = 1$, (iii) $f(t) = t$, (iv) $f'(0) = 0$, (v) $f'(1) = 0$. Solving these equations gives the function

$$f(p) = \frac{1 + t - 3t^2}{t(1-t)}p^2 + \frac{-2 + 2t + 2t^2}{t(1-t)}p^3 + \frac{1 - 2t}{t(1-t)}p^4.$$

Suppose that f can realized by a convex combination of degree four polynomials. Then the leading coefficient of f must be between -1 and 1 since all achievable polynomials have leading coefficient -1 or 1. Thus, $0 \leq \frac{1-2t}{t(1-t)} \leq 1$, which implies that $2 - \phi \leq t \leq \phi - 1$. $\square$

Proof. [of Theorem 1.5B.] By construction $f_{V_1}(p) = p^2 + p^3 - p^5$ and $f_{V_2}(p) = 6p^2 - 9p^3 + 5p^4 - p^5$, so

$$f_R(p) = \frac{1 + t - 2t^2 - t^3}{t(1-t)}p^2 + \frac{-2 + t + t^2 + 2t^3}{t(1-t)}p^3 + \frac{1 - t^2 - t^3}{t(1-t)}p^4 - p^5.$$

We apply Lemma 3.1. First note that $0, t$, and 1 are fixed points. Let p be the fraction of input items firing. It show convergence to 0 when $p \leq t - \frac{1}{n}$. By Corollary 2.4, convergence to 1 for $p \geq t + \frac{1}{n}$ follows from the complementary construction.

First we show linear divergence from t. Let $g(p) = \frac{f(p)-p}{p(1-p)(p-t)} = \frac{1}{t} - \frac{t^2+t-1}{t(t-1)}p + p^2 = \frac{1}{t} + p(-\frac{t^2+t-1}{t(t-1)} + p)$. We claim that $g(p) \geq 1$ for $0 \leq p \leq 1$. If $-\frac{t^2+t-1}{t(t-1)} + p \geq 0$, then $g(p) \geq \frac{1}{t} \geq 1$. If $-\frac{t^2+t-1}{t(t-1)} + p < 0$, then $g(p) \geq \frac{1}{t} - \frac{t^2+t-1}{t(t-1)} + 1 = \frac{1}{1-t} \geq 1$. Thus as in the proof of part A, $c_1 = 1 + u(1-t)$ satisfies the first linear divergence condition. Next we show quadratic convergence. Let $u = 1/7$. Note that

$$f(p) \leq p^2(6 - 9p + 5p^2 - p^3) < 6p^2.$$

Since $6(1/7) < 1$, taking $c_3 = 6$ satisfies the first condition of quadratic convergence. Thus, we may apply Lemma 3.1 to conclude that in expectation items at level $\Omega(\log n + \log k)$ of the iterative construction compute a t-threshold function with probability at least $1 - 2^{-k}$.

It remains to show that no construction using trees with five leaves will yield quadratic convergence to a t-threshold function for t outside the range $0.26 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.74$. A t-threshold function with quadratic convergence must satisfy the following five constraints: (i) $f(0) = 0$, (ii) $f(1) = 1$, (iii) $f(t) = t$, (iv) $f'(0) = 0$, (v) $f'(1) = 0$. Such a function will have the form:

$$z_{d,t}(p) = \frac{1 + t - (3+d)t^2 + dt^3}{(1-t)t}p^2 + \frac{-2 + (2+d)t + (2+d)t^2 - 2dt^3}{(1-t)t}p^3 + \frac{1 - (2+2d)t + dt^2 + dt^3}{(1-t)t}p^4 + dp^5.$$

Since each achievable polynomial has leading coefficient -1 or 1, if $z_{d,t}(p)$ can written as a convex combination of achievable polynomials of degree five, then

$$z_{d,t}(p) = \beta z_{-1,t}(p) + (d + \beta)z_{1,t}(p),$$

where $z_{-1,t}(p)$ and $z_{1,t}(p)$ are convex combinations of achievable polynomials of degree five with leading coefficient -1 and 1 respectively and $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$. Thus, it suffices to determine the values of t for which $z_{-1,t}(p)$ is achievable through convex combinations and the values of t for which $z_{1,t}(p)$ is achievable through convex combinations.

Claim: Let $\alpha(t) = \frac{-1+5t-4t^2+t^3}{5t(t-1)}$. If the function $z_{-1,t}(p)$ is achievable through convex combinations then $0 \leq \alpha(t) \leq 1$, meaning $0.26 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.74$.

Notice that achievable polynomials of degree five with leading coefficient -1 have coefficient $a_3 \geq -9$ (see Table 1). It follows that

$$\frac{-2+t+t^2+2t^3}{t(1-t)} \geq -9 \quad \text{and} \quad 2(-1+5t-4t^2+t^3) \geq 0,$$

so $\alpha(t) \geq 0$. Next, note that the coefficient a_4 of $z_{-1,t}(p)$ must be non-negative (see Table 1). It follows that

$$\frac{1-t^2-t^3}{t(1-t)} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad -1+5t-4t^2+t^3 \leq 5t-5t^2,$$

so $\alpha(t) \leq 1$.

Claim: Let $\gamma(t) = 1-2t-t^2+t^3$ and $\beta(t) = 1-3t^2+t^3$. If the function $z_{1,t}(p)$ is achievable through convex combinations, then $\gamma(t) \leq 0$ and $\beta(t) \geq 0$, meaning $.445 \lesssim t \lesssim .653$

Assume $z_{-1,t}(p)$ is achievable through convex combinations. Notice that for degree five achievable polynomials with $a_1 = 0$ and $a_5 = 1$, $-4 \leq a_4 \leq -2$. It follows that

$$-4 \leq \frac{1-4t+t^2+t^3}{(1-t)t} \leq -2,$$

so $\gamma(t) \leq 0$ and $\beta(t) \geq 0$.

Now consider $t \lesssim 0.26$ or $t \gtrsim 0.74$. By the above claims, $z_{-1,t}(p)$ and $z_{1,t}(p)$ are not achievable through convex combinations. It follows that $z_{d,t}(p)$ is not achievable through convex combinations, meaning no construction on trees with five leaves that converges quadratically to a t-threshold function for $t \lesssim 0.26$ or $t \gtrsim 0.74$. □

Using a similar technique as in the proof above, it is possible to show that the analogous constructions on six and seven leaves yield iterative constructions that converge quadratically to threshold functions for thresholds in the ranges $0.15 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.85$ and $0.11 \lesssim t \lesssim 0.89$ respectively. However, it is not possible to generalize such a construction beyond this point. Instead, we observe the emergence of a staircase functions, which will be discussed in Example 4.4.

3.2 Quadratic convergence for arbitrary thresholds.

In this section we show that as t approaches 0 or 1, increasingly large building blocks trees are needed to construct an iterative tree that converges quadratically to a t- threshold function. Further, we give a construction that exhibits quadratic convergence for arbitrary thresholds near 0 and 1. We begin by proving Theorem 1.6, which can be restated as follows: Let f be

an achievable polynomial with fixed points 0, t, and 1 that exhibits quadratic convergence to a t-threshold function. Then, f has degree at least $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2s}}$ where $s = \min\{t, 1-t\}$.

Proof. [of Theorem 1.6.] Let f be an achievable polynomial with fixed points 0, t, and 1 that exhibits quadratic convergence. Then for ε sufficiently small, $f(\varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon^2)$, which implies $a_1 = 0$. For $x < \frac{1}{2d}$, we have

$$f(x) = a_2x^2 + a_3x^2 + \cdots + a_dx^d \leq d^2x^2 + d^3x^3 + \ldots d^dx^d < d^2x^2\left(\frac{1}{1-dx}\right) < 2d^2x^2.$$

Since t is a fixed point of f, $f(t) = t$. Thus, $t < 2d^2t^2$. It follows that $d > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2t}}$. By Lemma 2.3, if there exists an achievable polynomial with fixed point t, then there also exists a complementary achievable polynomial with fixed point $1-t$. Thus, $d > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1-t)}}$. □

We now prove that a nearly matching iterative construction exists. To achieve quadratic convergence to thresholds near 0 or 1, we average trees of the form A_k and A_{k+1} or B_k and B_{k+1} respectively.

Proof. [of Theorem 1.7.] By Corollary 2.4, it suffices to prove the theorem for $1-\phi \leq t < 1$. The complement of a construction that achieves quadratic convergence to a t-threshold function yields quadratic convergence for to a $(1-t)$-threshold function. By Lemma 2.11, there exists k and α such that $f = \alpha f_{B_k} + (1-\alpha)f_{B_{k+1}}$has fixed point t. Moreover, $\frac{t-f(p)}{t-p} \geq \left(1 + \frac{p(1-p)}{t}\right)$.

We apply Lemma 3.1 to prove that f converges to a t-threshold function. Let p be the probability an input item is on. First suppose that $p \leq t - \frac{1}{n}$. We show linear divergence away from t. For any constant $0 < u < t$, and $u \leq p \leq t - \frac{1}{n}$ by Lemma 2.11 we have

$$t - f(p) \geq (t-p)\left(1 + \frac{p(1-p)}{t}\right) \geq (t-p)\left(1 + \frac{u(1-t)}{t}\right).$$

Thus, $c_1 = 1 + \frac{u(1-t)}{t}$ is a valid choice for c_1 in Lemma 3.1.

Next, we claim that $u = 1 - \frac{1}{k-1}$ is a valid starting point for quadratic convergence towards 0. We write $f(p) = p^2(\alpha d_k(p) + (1-\alpha)d_{k+1}(p))$ where $d_k(p) = 2p^{k-2} - p^{2k-2}$. Let $d(p) = \alpha d_k(p) + (1-\alpha)d_{k+1}(p)$. Note that $d(p)$ is increasing on the interval $(0, u)$ since each d_k increases on this interval. For $p < u$,

$$\frac{2k-4}{2k-2} = u > u^k > p^k.$$

It follows that $d_k'(p) = p^{k-3}((2k-4) - (2k-2)p^k) > 0$. Thus, d_k is increasing on the interval $(0, u)$. Thus, $c_3 = d(u)$ is a valid choice for c_3 in Lemma 3.1.

It remains to show that for $p \geq t + \frac{1}{n}$ we observe linear divergence from t then quadratic convergence to 1. We show linear divergence away from t. For any constant $t < v < 1$, and $t + \frac{1}{n} \leq p \leq 1$ by Lemma 2.11 we have

$$f(p) - t \geq (p-t)\left(1 + \frac{p(1-p)}{t}\right) \geq (p-t)\left(1 + \frac{t(1-v)}{t}\right).$$

Thus, $c_2 = 1 + \frac{t(1-v)}{t}$ is a valid choice for c_2 in Lemma 3.1.

We claim that $v > 1 - \frac{1}{8(k+1)^2}$ is a valid starting point for quadratic convergence to 1. By Corollary 2.4, $f_{A_k}(1-p) = 1 - f_{B_k}(p)$. It follows

$$1 - f(p) = \alpha - \alpha f_{B_k}(p) + (1-\alpha) - (1-\alpha) f_{B_{k+1}}(p) = \alpha f_{A_k}(1-p) + (1-\alpha) f_{A_{k+1}}(1-p).$$

Recall from the proof of Theorem 1.6, $f(x) < 2dx^2$ where d is the degree of x. Therefore,

$$f_{A_k}(1-p) < 8k^2(1-p)^2 < 8(k+1)^2(1-p)^2 \text{ and } f_{A_{k+1}}(1-p) < 8(k+1)^2(1-p)^2.$$

Since $(1-v)8(k+1)^2 < 1$, $c_4 = 8(k+1)^2$ is a valid choice for c_4 in Lemma 3.1. □

4 Convergence of iterative constructions to staircase functions

In this section, we explore the possible functions that can be achieved by sampling from the high-level items of iterative constructions with no restrictions on the size of building block trees.

Definition 4.1 The function f is a staircase function if $f(x) = p_i$ on the interval (a_i, a_{i+1}) where $a_0 = 0 < a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_k < a_{k+1} = 1$, $0 = p_0 < p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_{k-1} < p_k = 1$.

We will show in Theorem 4.10 that any staircase function in which each step intersects the line $y = x$, or more precisely $a_i \leq p_i \leq a_{i+1}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$, can be approximated by a high-level of an iterative tree.

This result may seem to suggest that the high-level items of these constructions are pseudorandom. However, this is not the case. The output of a high-level item is highly influenced by which of tree it is the root of. The distribution of items firing at a given high-level behaves according to the staircase function, rather than each item individually behaving according to the staircase function.

We begin by giving a couple of examples of staircase functions arising from probability distributions of small trees. The first example is a one step staircase.

Example 4.2 Consider the iterative construction that selects a tree that computes $A \wedge B \wedge C$ with probability α and a tree that computes $A \vee B \vee C$ with probability $1 - \alpha$. Let $f(p) = \alpha(1-(1-p)^3) + (1-\alpha)p^3$ be the corresponding polynomial. For $\alpha \in (1/3, 2/3)$, f converges to an $(3\alpha - 1)$ one step staircase function, i.e. takes value $3\alpha - 1$ on $(0, 1)$. For $\alpha = 1/2$ and inputs in which the fraction of inputs firing is not 0 or 1, approximately half the high-level items will fire. Figure 4 illustrates f for $\alpha = 1/2$. ♦

Lemma 4.3 *Consider the iterative construction that selects a tree that computes $A \wedge B \wedge C$ with probability α and a tree that computes $A \vee B \vee C$ with probability $1 - \alpha$ where $\alpha \in (1/3, 2/3)$. Let $f(p) = \alpha(1-(1-p)^3) + (1-\alpha)p^3$ be the corresponding polynomial. Then $3\alpha - 1$ is the only fixed point of f on $(0, 1)$ and it is an attractive fixed point.*



Figure 4: An iterative construction for the above function converges a 1/2 one step staircase function. Left to right: $f(p), f^{(5)}(p), f^{(10)}(p), f^{(30)}(p)$.

Proof. The only fixed points of $f(p)$ are the roots of $f(p) - p$, which are $0, 1, 3\alpha - 1$. To prove that $3\alpha - 1$ is an attractive fixed point, we show that $f'(3\alpha - 1) < 1$. We compute $f'(p) = 3\alpha(1-p)^2 + 3(1-\alpha)p^2$. For $\alpha \in (1/3, 2/3)$, we have

$$f'(3\alpha - 1) = 3 - 9\alpha + 9\alpha^2 < 1.$$

□

We remark that roughly $\log(1/\delta) + \log(1/\varepsilon)$ levels are needed (and suffice) to get within δ of $\alpha = 1/2$ where ε is the distance of the input from 1/2. We omit the proof, which is similar to other proofs of finite bounds in this paper.

In the above construction, a randomly sampled high-level item fires with probability approximately half. However, whether a fixed high-level item fires is not pseudorandom. Given that half of the items at level $k-1$ fire, an item at level k that is the root of an $A \wedge B \wedge C$ building block tree fires with probability 1/8. An item at level k that is the root of a $A \vee B \vee C$ building block tree fires with probability 7/8.

Another simple example of a staircase function is the generalization of the construction given in Theorem 1.5.

Example 4.4 For $k \geq 4$, the function $h = (f_{A_k} + f_{B_k})/2$ converges to a three step staircase function. The function h has a non-attractive fixed point $s \in (0, 1/2)$, a non-attractive fixed point $t \in (1/2, 1)$, and an attractive fixed point at 1/2. Figure 5 illustrates $h_6(p)$. Therefore, for inputs in the interval (s, t), approximately half the high-level items return 0 and half return 1. For inputs in the intervals $[0, s]$ and $[t, 1]$, high-level items return 0 and 1 respectively with high probability. ♦

Lemma 4.5 *Let $k \geq 4$. Consider an iterative construction in which A_k and B_k are each selected with probability 1/2. Let $h = (f_{A_k} + f_{B_k})/2$ be the corresponding polynomial. Then 1/2 is an attractive fixed point of h.*

Proof. Let $h = (f_{A_k} + f_{B_k})/2$. It suffices to show $h'(1/2) < 1$ for $k \geq 4$. We compute $h'(p) = k\left(p^{k-1} + (1-p)^{k-1}\right) - k\left(p^{2k-1} + (1-p)^{2k-1}\right)$. It follows for $k \geq 4$ that

$$h'(1/2) = k\left(2^{-(k-2)} - k2^{-(2k-2)}\right) = \frac{k}{2^{k-2}}\left(1 - 2^{-k}\right) < 1.$$

□



Figure 5: For $k \geq 4$, the function $(f_{A_k} + f_{B_k})/2$ converges to a three step staircase function. Left to right: $f(p), f^{(5)}(p), f^{(10)}(p), f^{(30)}(p)$.

Finally, we show that it is possible to approximate any staircase function. The proof will rely on Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 4.7, which describe the scope of achievable polynomials for a single tree.

Lemma 4.6 *Let t be a fixed point of some achievable polynomial f with attractive fixed points 0 and 1, $0 < t < 1$. Then, for any $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ there exists an achievable polynomial g such that $f(x) < \delta$ for $x \in [0, t - \varepsilon]$ and $f(x) > 1 - \delta$ for $x \in [t + \varepsilon, 1]$.*

Proof. First we claim that if f is achievable, then $f^{(k)}$ is also achievable. Let f be the polynomial corresponding to a tree T. Define T^1 to be the tree T modified so that each of the leaves is replaced with a copy of T. Let T^k be the tree T^{k-1} modified so that each of the leaves is replaced with a copy of T. Note that $f^{(k)}$ is the polynomial for T^k.

Let f be the polynomial for which t is a fixed point. It suffices to show that there exists some k such that $f^{(k)}(x) < \delta$ for $x \in [0, t - \varepsilon]$ and $f^{(k)}(x) > 1 - \delta$ for $x \in [t + \varepsilon, 1]$. Since t is the only fixed point and 0 is an attractive fixed point, for $p \in [\delta, t - \varepsilon]$, $f(p) < p$. Let $m = \min_{p \in [\delta, t-\varepsilon]} p - f(p)$. Then for all ℓ, $f^{(\ell)}(p) \leq t - \varepsilon - \ell m$ or $f^{(\ell)}(p) < \delta$. Let $x \in [0, t - \varepsilon]$. Then for $k = \lceil \frac{t-\varepsilon}{m} \rceil$, $f^{(k)}(x) \leq f^{(k)}(t - \varepsilon) \leq \delta$. A similar argument proves the case when $x \in [t + \varepsilon, 1]$. □

The following lemma says that with a single tree, the set of achievable fixed points is dense in $(0, 1)$. A weaker version of this lemma in which the building blocks of the constructions are arbitrary circuits rather than trees is given by [Moore and Shannon, 1956]. Our proof is inspired by their argument.

Lemma 4.7 *The set of fixed points of achievable polynomials is dense in $[0, 1]$.*

The proof will rely on the following claims.

Claim 4.8 *Let f, g be achievable polynomials such that $g \leq p$ and f has fixed point r, $0 < r < 1$. Let $x = g^{-1}(r)$. Then for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists k such that the fixed point of $f^{(k)}(g(p))$ is in $(x, x + \varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Note that for any k, $f^{(k)}(g(x)) = r < x$. Therefore, to prove that there is a fixed point in $(x, x + \varepsilon)$, it suffices to show that $f^{(k)}(g(x + \varepsilon)) > x + \varepsilon$. Since g is increasing, $g(x + \varepsilon) = r + \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. By the same arguement in the second paragraph of the proof of Lemma 4.6, there exists k such that $f^{(k)}(r + \delta) > \alpha$ for any α. Taking $\alpha = x + \varepsilon$, we have $x + \varepsilon < f^{(k)}(r + \delta) = f^{(k)}(g(x + \varepsilon))$. □

Claim 4.9 *Let T_j be the tree that computes $(x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \cdots \vee x_j) \wedge x_{j+1}$ and let $g(p,j) = p(1-(1-p)^j)$ be the corresponding polynomial. Then*

1. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and fixed $p \in (0,1)$, there exists j such that $p - g(p,j) < \varepsilon$.*
2. *For all $p > 2 - \phi \approx .38$ and $j \geq 2$, $p - g(p,j) \geq g^{-1}(p,j) - p$.*
3. *For $j \geq 2$, $h(p) = p - g(p,j)$ is decreasing on $(.38, 1)$.*

Proof. Statement (1) follows from the limit computation

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} p - g(p,j) = \lim_{j\to\infty} p(1-p)^j = 0.$$

For (2) we first observe that for $p \in [2-\phi, 1]$,

$$g'(p,j) = 1 - (1-p)^j + pj(1-p)^{j-1} = 1 - (1-p)^{j-1}(1-p(1+j)) > 1$$

where $g'(p,j)$ denotes the derivative with respect to p. For $p \in [2-\phi, 1]$,

$$\frac{p - g(p)}{g^{-1}(p) - p} > \min_{k\in[2-\phi,1]} g'(k) > 1.$$

Finally, for (3), note that $h'(p) = 1 - g'(p,j) < 0$ for $p \in [2-\phi, 1]$. □

Proof.[of Lemma 4.7]. To prove that the set of achievable fixed points is dense in $(0,1)$, it suffices to show that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a set of achievable fixed points S such that for all $x \in (1/2, 1)$, there exists $s \in S$ such that $|x - s| < \varepsilon$. Corollary 2.4 will imply density in $(0, 1/2)$.

We construct S as follows. Let $f_0 = f_{B_2}$. Recall f_0 has fixed point $p_0 = 2 - \phi \approx .38$. Let $g(p) = p(1-(1-p)^j)$ where j is chosen according to Claim 4.9.1 so that $p_0 - g(p_0) < \varepsilon/2$. We define p_i and f_i inductively, where f_i is an achievable polynomial with fixed point p_i. Let $x_{i+1} = g^{-1}(p_i)$. By Claim 4.8, there exists k such that the fixed point of $f_i^{(k)}(g(x_{i+1}))$ is less than $x_{i+1} + \varepsilon/2$. Define $f_{i+1} = f_i^{(k)}(g(p))$ and p_{i+1} to be the corresponding fixed point. Apply Claim 4.9, we observe

$$p_{i+1} - p_i < x_{i+1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - p_i = g^{-1}(p_i) - p_i + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \overset{4.9.2}{\leq} p_i - g(p_i) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \overset{4.9.3}{\leq} p_0 - g(p_0) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \overset{4.9.1}{\leq} \varepsilon.$$

It follows that $S = \{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$ satisfy the desired property that every point in $(1/2, 1)$ is within ε of some $p_i \in S$. □

Theorem 4.10 *For any $0 = p_0 < p_1 < \cdots < p_k = 1$, $0 = a_0 < a_1 < \dots a_k < a_{k+1} = 1$, $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < a_{i+1} - a_i$ for all i, there exists a probability distribution on a set of trees such that for $0 \leq i \leq k$ the corresponding polynomial f has the property that $|f(x) - p_i| < \delta$ for all $x \in (a_i + \varepsilon, a_{i+1} - \varepsilon)$.*

Proof. We define a probability distribution of a set of trees, the existence of which are guaranteed by Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.6. For $1 \leq i \leq k$, let t_i be an achievable fixed point in $(a_i - \varepsilon/2, a_i + \varepsilon/2)$. Let f_i be an achievable function with fixed point t_i the property that $f_i(x) < \delta$ for $x \in [0, t_i - \varepsilon/2]$ and $f_i(x) > 1 - \delta$ for $x \in [t_i + \varepsilon/2, 1]$. It follows that $f_i(x) < \delta$ for $x \in [0, a_i - \varepsilon]$ and $f_i(x) > 1 - \delta$ for $x \in [a_i + \varepsilon, 1]$. Let $\alpha_1 = p_1$ and $\alpha_i = p_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$. Let $f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j f_j$.

We show f is the desired function by computing $f(x)$ for $x \in (a_i + \varepsilon, a_{i+1} - \varepsilon)$. Note that $f_j(x) < \delta$ for $j \leq i - 1$ and $f_j(x) > 1 - \delta$ for $j \geq i$. Observe

$$p_i - \delta \leq p_i(1 - \delta) \leq f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{i} \alpha_j f_j + \sum_{j=i+1}^{k} \alpha_j f_j \leq p_i + \delta(1 - p_i) \leq p_i + \delta.$$

Thus, $|f(x) - p_i| < \delta$ for all $x \in (a_i + \varepsilon, a_{i+1} - \varepsilon)$. □

Theorem 4.10 implies that any staircase function for which $a_i \leq p_i \leq a_{i+1}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$, can be approximated by the distribution of items at a high-level of an iterative tree. The condition that $a_i \leq p_i \leq a_{i+1}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$ guarantees the heights of each step are fixed points, and therefore the stairs are maintained when f is iterated.

5 Finite iterative constructions of threshold trees

In the above section, we analyzed the behavior of iterative trees in the limit with respect to level width. We assumed that for any input the number of items turned on at level l of the tree is equal to its expectation, $mf^{(l)}(p)$ where m is the width of level l and p is the fraction of the inputs turned on. In a "bottom up" construction in which the items of one level are fixed before the next level is built, we note that the chance that the number of items that fire at a given level deviates from expectation is non-trivial. In this section, we give a bound on the width of the levels required to achieve a desired degree of accuracy for finite realizations of iterative constructions.

Remark 5.1 We can use a transition matrix to directly compute the probability that a high-level item of an iterative construction fires given the width of the levels. Let f be the function corresponding to the construction, p be the fraction of input items firing, and m the width of the levels. Define $s \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times(m+1)}$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1)\times(m+1)}$, and $t \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times(m+1)}$

$$s_i = \binom{m}{i} f(p)^i \left(1 - f(p)\right)^{m-i}, \quad A_{i,j} = \binom{m}{j} f\left(\frac{i}{m}\right)^j \left(1 - f\left(\frac{i}{m}\right)\right)^{m-j}, \quad t_i = i$$

for $i, j = 0, 1, \ldots m$. Then the probability that an item at level L fires is $sA^{L-1}t^T$.

We will use the following concentration inequalities.

Lemma 5.2 *(Chernoff) Let $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots Y_m$ be independent with $0 \leq Y_i \leq 1$ and $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\mathsf{Pr}(Y - E(Y) \geq \delta E(Y)) \leq \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\delta^2 E(Y)}{2 + \delta}\right).$$

Lemma 5.3 *Let X be a sum of n binomial random variables with mean μ. Then, for $k \geq n\mu$,*

$$\mathsf{Pr}(X \geq k) = \sum_{i=k}^{n} \binom{n}{i} \mu^i (1-\mu)^{n-i} < \mathsf{exp}\left(-nH(\mu, k/n)\right)$$

where $H(p,q) = q\log(q/p) + (1-q)\log((1-q)/(1-p))$.

For ease of notation, all statements in this section about the probability of X_{i+1} taking some values refers to the probability of X_{i+1} taking some values given X_i.

The following lemma describes linear divergence for finite width constructions.

Lemma 5.4 *Consider the construction of a t-threshold function in which each level ℓ has m_ℓ items and the fraction of input items firing is at least ε below the threshold t. Let d be the minimum value of $\frac{f(p)-p}{p(1-p)(p-t)}$ on the interval $[0,1]$. Then, with probability at least $1-\gamma$, the fraction of inputs firing at level $\Omega(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ will be less than any fixed constant u when*

$$m_\ell = \frac{8\ln(\frac{1}{u(1-t)\gamma})}{d^2 u(1-t)^2\left(1+\frac{c_1}{2}\right)^{\ell-1}\varepsilon^2}$$

where c_1 is the linear divergence constant.

Proof. Let X_i be the fraction of items firing at level i. Then $E(X_i) = f(X_{i-1})$. In expectation, the sequence $X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots$ converges to 0. We will show that with probability at least $1-\gamma$, the sequence obeys the *half-progress* relation $X_{i+1} \leq \frac{X_i + f(X_i)}{2}$ and therefore $X_L < u$ for $L = \Omega(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$.

Write $f(p) - p = p(1-p)(p-t)g(p)$ where g is a polynomial in p. Let d be the minimum value obtained by g on the interval $[0,1]$. First we compute probability that $X_{i+1} > \frac{X_i + f(X_i)}{2}$ given X_i by applying Lemma 5.2. Observe

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Pr}\left(X_{i+1} > \frac{X_i + f(X_i)}{2}\right) &= \mathsf{Pr}\left(X_{i+1} - E(X_{i+1}) > \frac{X_i - f(X_i)}{2}\right) \\
&\leq \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\left(\frac{X_i - f(X_i)}{2f(X_i)}\right)^2 m f(X_i)}{2 + \frac{X_i - f(X_i)}{2f(X_i)}}\right) \\
&= \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{(X_i(1-X_i)(X_i-t)g(X_i))^2 m}{2(X_i + 3(X_i + X_i(1-X_i)(X_i-t)g(X_i)))}\right) \\
&\leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{X_i(1-X_i)^2(t-X_i)^2 d^2 m}{8}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon_i = t - X_i$ and $\alpha = \frac{u(1-t)^2 d^2}{8}$. Then for $u \leq X_i \leq t - \varepsilon$,

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left(X_{i+1} > \frac{X_i + f(X_i)}{2}\right) < \mathsf{exp}\left(-\alpha m \varepsilon_i^2\right).$$

Next we compute the probability that i is the first value for which the half-progress relation is not satisfied given $X_i > u$. If the half-progress relation is satisfied meaning

$X_{i+1} > \frac{X_i + f(X_i)}{2}$, then $\varepsilon_{i+1} \geq \varepsilon_i \beta$ where $\beta = 1 + \frac{u}{2}(1-t)$. It follows that if the half-progress relation is satisfied for all $j < i$, then $\varepsilon_{i+1} \geq \varepsilon \beta^i$. Thus,

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left(i \text{ is the first value for which } X_{i+1} > \frac{X_i + f(X_i)}{2}\right) \leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-\alpha m \varepsilon^2 \beta^{2i}\right).$$

By linear divergence, there exists $L = \Omega(\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$ such that if the sequence satisfies the half-progress relation for all $i < L$, then $X_L < u$. We bound the probability that this does not happen. Let $m_\ell = \frac{8 \ln(\frac{1}{u(1-t)\gamma})}{d^2 u(1-t)^2 \beta^i \varepsilon^2}$. For ease of notation, let $c = \ln \frac{1}{u(1-t)\gamma} < 1$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Pr}(X_L > u) &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{L} \mathsf{exp}\left(-\alpha m_\ell \varepsilon^2 \beta^{2i}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{L} \mathsf{exp}\left(-c\beta^i\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{L} \mathsf{exp}\left(-c(1 + iu(1-t))\right) \\
&< \mathsf{exp}\left(-c\right) \sum_{i=0}^{L} e^{-iu(1-t))} \\
&< \frac{\mathsf{exp}\left(-c\right)}{1 - \mathsf{exp}\left(-u(1-t)\right)} \\
&< \frac{\mathsf{exp}\left(-c\right)}{u(1-t)} = \gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 5.5 *Consider the construction of a t-threshold function with linear convergence given in Theorem 1.3 in which each level ℓ has m_ℓ items and the fraction of input items firing is at least ε from the threshold t. Then, with probability at least $1 - \gamma$, items at level $\Omega(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ will accurately compute the threshold function for $m = \Omega\left(\ln(\frac{1}{\gamma})(\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2})\right)$.*

Proof. Let X_i be the fraction of items firing at level i. Then $E(X_i) = f(X_{i-1})$. By Corollary 2.4, it suffices to consider the case when the fraction of inputs firing is less that $t - \varepsilon$. As proved in Theorem 1.3, in expectation, the sequence $X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots$ convergences to 0. We will show that with probability at least $1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}$, the sequence drops below $\frac{\gamma}{2}$. First we apply Lemma 5.4. Recall that the polynomial corresponding to this construction is $f(p) = p + p(1-p)(p-t)$ and therefore d in the statement of Lemma 5.4 is 1. Let u be a constant $0 < u < t$, $m \geq \frac{8 \ln(\frac{4}{u(1-t)\gamma})}{u(1-t)^2 \varepsilon^2}$ and $L = \Omega(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Thus, $X_L < u$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}$.

Next we show that given $X_L < u$ the probability that the sequence continues to obey the half-progress relation (as defined in Lemma 5.4) and drops below $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ is at least $1 - \frac{\gamma}{4}$. Let $\alpha = \frac{(1-u)^2(t-u)^2}{8}$. Given a fixed value $X_i < u$,

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left(X_{i+1} > \frac{X_i + f(X_i)}{2}\right) < \mathsf{exp}\left(-\alpha m X_i^2\right).$$

We compute the probability that $N+i$ is the first value for which the half-progress relation is not satisfied given $X_L < u$. If $X_i < u$ and the half-progress relation is satisfied at i then $X_{i+1} \leq X_i(1-\beta)$ where $\beta = \frac{1}{2}(1-u)(t-u)$. It follows that if the half-progress relation is satisfied for all $j < i$, then $X_{N+i} \leq (1-\beta)^i u$. Let $L' = \frac{4}{(1-u)(t-u)} \log_2 \left(\frac{2u}{\gamma}\right)$. If for all $L \leq i \leq L + L'$, the half-progress relation is satisfied then $X_{L+L'} < u(1-\beta)^{L'} < \frac{\gamma}{2}$. We bound the probability that this does not happen. Let $m \geq \frac{16 \ln\left(\frac{16}{(1-u)(t-u)\gamma}\right)}{(1-u)^2(t-u)^2\gamma}$. For ease of notation, let $c = \ln\left(\frac{8}{\beta\gamma}\right)$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Pr}\left(X_{L+L'} > \frac{\gamma}{2}\right) &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{L'} \mathsf{exp}\left(-mX_i\alpha\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{L'} \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{2cX_i}{\gamma}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{L'} \mathsf{exp}\left(-c(1-\beta)^{-(L'-i)}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{L'} \mathsf{exp}\left(-c(1-\beta)^{i}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\beta L'} \frac{1}{\beta} \mathsf{exp}\left(-ce^{i}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{2\mathsf{exp}\left(-c\right)}{\beta} \\
&= \frac{\gamma}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}$, items at level $\Omega(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$ of an iterative construction with width m fire with probability at most $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ for $m = \Omega\left(\ln(\frac{1}{\gamma})(\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2})\right)$. Thus, the iterative construction accurately computes the threshold function with probability at least $(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2})^2 > 1 - \gamma$. □

We give a tighter bound for the accuracy of the finite width construction for functions with quadratic convergence. We now prove Theorem 1.8, which can be restated as follows: in order to accurately compute, with probability at least $1 - \gamma$, a t-threshold function for inputs in which the fraction of inputs firing is within ε of t , the width of the levels must be $\Omega\left(\frac{\ln(1/\gamma)}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$.

Proof.[of Theorem 1.8.] Let X_i be the fraction of items firing at level i. Then $E(X_i) = f(X_{i-1})$. By Corollary 2.4, it suffices to consider the case when the fraction of inputs firing is less that $t - \varepsilon$. As proved in Lemma 3.1, in expectation, the sequence $X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots$ convergences to 0. We will show that with probability at least $1 - \gamma$, the sequence reaches 0.

First we apply Lemma 5.4. Recall from the proof of Theorem 1.5, that the minimum value of $g(p) = \frac{f(p)-p}{p(1-p)(p-t)}$ is 1 on the interval $[0, 1]$. Therefore for such constructions d in

the statement of Lemma 5.4 is 1. For constructions described in Theorem 1.7, the minimum value of $g(p) = \frac{f(p)-p}{p(1-p)(p-t)}$ is $\frac{1}{t}$ on the interval $[0,1]$, as proved in Lemma 2.11. Therefore for such constructions d in the statement of Lemma 5.4 is $1/t$. Let u be the constant $0 < u < t$ in quadratic convergence as in Lemma 3.1, $m_\ell \geq \frac{8\ln(\frac{4}{u(1-t)\gamma})}{d^2u(1-t)^2(1+(c_1/2)^{\ell-1}\varepsilon^2}$ and $L = \Omega(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Thus, $X_L < u$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}$.

Next, we bound the probability given $X_L < u$, that $X_{L+r} = 0$. We say that X_{k+1} *regresses* if $X_{k+1} \geq u$. For $m \geq \frac{l}{u}$ and c_3 as in Lemma 3.1, we apply Lemma 5.3 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Pr}(X_{k+1} \geq X_k) &= \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{u}{e}n \rceil}^{m} \binom{m}{i} f(p)^i (1-f(p))^{m-i} \\
&\leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-m\left(p\log\left(\frac{p}{f(p)}\right) + (1-p)\log\left(\frac{1-p}{1-f(p)}\right)\right)\right) \\
&\leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-m\left(p\log\left(\frac{1}{c_3 p}\right) + (1-p)\log\left(1-\frac{p-f(p)}{1-f(p)}\right)\right)\right) \\
&\leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-m\left(p\log\left(\frac{1}{c_3 p}\right) + (1-p)\left(-\frac{p-f(p)}{1-f(p)}\right)\right)\right) \\
&\leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-m\left(p\log\left(\frac{1}{c_3 p}\right) - p(1-p)\right)\right) \\
&\leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-mp\log\left(\frac{1}{c_3 pe}\right)\right) \\
&\leq (c_3 ue)^\ell
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathsf{Pr}(X_L, X_{L+1}, \ldots X_{L+r} \text{ do not regress}) \geq 1 - r(c_3 ue)^\ell.$$

Next we bound the probability that given $X_k < u$, $X_{k+1} = 0$.

$$\mathsf{Pr}(X_{k+1} = 0 | X_k \leq u) = (1 - f(X_k))^m \geq (1-u^2)^m \geq 1 - mu^2 = 1 - lu.$$

Therefore

$$\mathsf{Pr}(X_{L+r} = 0 | X_L, X_{L+1}, \ldots X_{L+r} \text{ do not regress}) \geq 1 - (lu)^r.$$

Let $l = r = \max\left\{c_3 e, \min\left\{\frac{1}{2u}, \log_2\left(\frac{4}{\gamma}\right)\right\}\right\}$. It follows $\log_2\left(\frac{4}{\gamma}\right) < l\log_2\left(\frac{1}{lu}\right)$ and therefore $\frac{4}{\gamma} < \left(\frac{1}{lu}\right)^\ell$. We now compute

$$\mathsf{Pr}(X_{L+r} = 0) \geq 1 - r(c_3 ue)^\ell - (lu)^r \geq 1 - 2(lu)^\ell \geq 1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

We have shown that given $X_L < u$, $\mathsf{Pr}(X_{L+r} > 0) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2}$. Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \gamma$, items at level $\Omega(\log\frac{1}{\gamma} + \log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$ do not fire for $m = \Omega\left(\frac{\ln(\frac{1}{\gamma})}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$. □

5.1 Exponential and wild constructions

In this section, we analyze exponential constructions, where items are chosen with probabilities proportional to their weights, and the latter decay exponentially with time, by a factor of $e^{-\alpha}$. The wild construction is the special case of the exponential construction in which the $\alpha = 0$, i.e. the weights of the items do not decay with time. Here we analyze the wild and exponential constructions for the probability distribution given in Theorem 1.3, which converges linearly to a $t-$threshold function. Analogous results, up to constants, hold for the constructions with quadratic convergence.

Throughout this section, we use the following notation. We define X_k to be the probability an item chosen according to the weights at the beginning of the $k+1$ iteration is 1. We define

$$d_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} e^{-j\alpha}$$

$$W_k = ne^{-\alpha k} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} e^{-j\alpha}.$$

Additionally, we use the following concentration inequality.

Lemma 5.6 *(Hoeffding) Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be independent random variables with $X_i \in [a_i, b_i]$, and $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then for $t > 0$,*

$$\mathsf{Pr}[X > \mathsf{E}[X] + t] \leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - b_i)^2}\right).$$

The following two lemmas lay the foundation for the proofs of Theorem 1.9 and 1.10, which prove convergence for the wild and exponential constructions respectively.

Lemma 5.7 *Consider an exponential construction corresponding to a t-threshold function given in Theorem 1.3. Let X_k be the probability an item chosen according to the weights at the beginning of the $k+1$ iteration is 1, and let $\varepsilon = t - X_k$. Let A_i be the event that $X_{k+i} \leq X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Then*

$$\mathsf{Pr}[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s} A_i] \geq \prod_{i=1}^{s} 1 - \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2 \beta_i^2}{2d_i}\right)$$

where $\beta_i = ne^{-(k+i)\alpha} + \sum_{j=i}^{k+i-1} e^{-j\alpha} = W_{k+i} - d_i$.

Proof. Note

$$\mathsf{Pr}[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s} A_i] = \mathsf{Pr}[A_s | \bigwedge_{j=1}^{s-1} A_i] \mathsf{Pr}[\bigwedge_{j=1}^{s-1} A_j] = \prod_{i=1}^{s} \mathsf{Pr}[A_i | \bigwedge_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j].$$

We now bound $\mathsf{Pr}[A_i | \bigwedge_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j]$. Let $y_1, \ldots y_i$ be random variables where y_j takes value $\frac{e^{-(i-j)\alpha}}{d}$ if the $(k+j)^{th}$ item fires. Let $Y = \sum_{j=1}^{i} y_j$. We compute

$$X_{k+i} = \frac{W_k X_k e^{-i\alpha} + dY}{W_{k+i}}.$$

The statement $X_{k+i} \geq X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ is equivalent to the following statements, with $d = d_i$:

$$Y \geq \frac{W_{k+i} - W_k e^{-i\alpha}}{d} X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \frac{W_{k+i}}{d}$$

$$Y \geq X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(\frac{n e^{-(k+i)\alpha} + \sum_{j=i}^{k+i-1} e^{-j\alpha}}{d} \right) = X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon \beta_i}{2d}$$

Note that $\mathsf{E}[Y] \leq X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. We have

$$\mathsf{Pr}[\overline{A_i} | \bigwedge_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j] = \mathsf{Pr}\left[Y \geq X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon \beta_i}{2d} \right] \leq \mathsf{Pr}\left[Y - \mathsf{E}[Y] \geq \frac{\varepsilon \beta_i}{2d} \right]$$

Note that $0 \leq y_i \leq \frac{e^{-(i-j)\alpha}}{d}$. Applying Hoeffding, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Pr}\left[Y - \mathsf{E}[Y] \geq \frac{\varepsilon \beta_i}{2d} \right] &\leq \mathsf{exp}\left(-2 \left(\frac{\varepsilon \beta_i}{2d} \right)^2 \frac{1}{d(1/d^2)} \right) \\ &= \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2 \beta_i^2}{2d} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathsf{Pr}[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{s} A_i] \geq \prod_{i=1}^{s} 1 - \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2 \beta_i^2}{2d_i} \right).$$

□

Lemma 5.8 *Consider an exponential construction corresponding to a t-threshold function given in Theorem 1.3. Let X_k be the probability an item chosen according to the weights at the beginning of the $k+1$ iteration is 1, and let $\varepsilon = t - X_k$. Assume $X_{k+i} \leq X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. Then*

$$\mathsf{E}[X_{k+s}] \leq X_k \prod_{i=1}^{s} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon(1-t)}{2W_{k+i}} \right).$$

Proof. For $X_{k+i-1} \leq X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, we use the definition of f to compute

$$f(X_{k+i-1}) = X_{k+i-1} - X_{k+i-1}(1 - X_{k+i-1})(t - X_{k+i-1}) \leq X_{k+i-1} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon(1-t)}{2} \right).$$

We compute

$$\mathsf{E}[X_{k+i}] = \frac{W_{k+i-1} X_{k+i-1} e^{-\alpha} + f(X_{k+i-1})}{W_{k+i}} \leq X_{k+i-1} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon(1-t)}{2W_{k+i}} \right).$$

□

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.9 and Theorem 1.10 which describe the number of items needed to guarantee high accuracy in the wild and exponential constructions respectively.

Proof.[of Theorem 1.9.] Assume that initial fraction of inputs firing is below the target threshold. The other case follows similarly. We divide the analysis into phases in each of which the total number of items double; in phase j, $2^j n$ new items are created. Let X_k be the fraction of the first k items and the n inputs that fire. First we show that with high probability, $X_{k+i} < X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ holds for the entire phase, meaning for all $1 \leq i \leq n+k$. We call this event A_j where j denotes the phase. Lemma 5.7 for $\alpha = 0$ states

$$\mathsf{Pr}[A] \geq \left(1 - e^{\frac{-\varepsilon^2(n+k)}{2}}\right)^{(n+k)} \geq 1 - (n+k)e^{\frac{-\varepsilon^2(n+k)}{2}}.$$

We bound the probability that A_j does not occur for some phase

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left[\bigvee_j \overline{A}_j\right] \leq \sum_j \mathsf{Pr}[\overline{A}_j] \leq \sum_j (2^j n)\mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2 2^j n}{2}\right) < 2n\mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2 n}{2}\right) < \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

Next, we compute the expected progress of the sequence of $X_k's$ corresponding to the final items in each phase. Setting $\alpha = 0$, Lemma 5.8 states

$$\mathsf{E}[X_{k+s}] \leq X_k\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon(1-t)}{2(n+k+s)}\right)^s \leq X_k\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon(1-t)s}{4(n+k+s)}\right) = X_k\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon(1-t)}{8}\right).$$

We now show that with high probability, the actual progress made by each phase is close to its expectation. Let $z_1, \ldots z_k$ be indicator random variables where $z_i = 1$ if i the $(k+i)^{th}$ item fires, and let $Z = \sum_{i=1}^{s} z_i$. We apply the Hoeffding bound and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Pr}\left[X_{k+s} - \mathsf{E}[X_{k+s}] > \frac{\varepsilon X_k(1-t)}{16}\right] &= \mathsf{Pr}\left[Z - \mathsf{E}[Z] > \frac{2s\varepsilon X_k(1-t)}{16}\right] \\ &< \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2(1-t)^2 X_k^2 s}{128}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Let B_j be the event that $X_{2^{j+1}n} - \mathsf{E}[X_{2^{j+1}n}] \leq \frac{\varepsilon X_k(1-t)}{16}$. Thus,

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left[\bigvee_j \overline{B}_j\right] \leq \sum_j \mathsf{Pr}[\overline{B}_j] \leq \sum_j \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2(1-t)^2 X_k^2 2^j n}{128}\right) < \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

We have shown, with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, the events A_j and B_j hold until the fraction of items firing is less that $\frac{\delta}{2}$. At this point, an item does not fire and therefore correctly computes the threshold function with probability $1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$.

To bound the total number of items, we compute the number of phases needed to achieve $X_k < \frac{\delta}{2}$. We divide the analysis into two parts, when $\epsilon = t - X_k < X_k$ and $X_k < t - X_k$. In the first part, $\varepsilon = t - X_k$ grows by a constant factor in each phase, while in the second part X_k decays by a constant factor in each phase. So the total number of phases needed

is $O\left(\log(1/\delta) + \log(1/\varepsilon)\right)$. The total number of items therefore is $O\left(n(\frac{1}{\delta^c} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^c})\right)$ for some absolute constant c. □

Proof.[of Theorem 1.10.] As before, we assume without loss of generality that the initial fraction of inputs firing is below the threshold. We divide the analysis into phases where s is the number of items created in a phase, k is the number of items created prior to the start of the phase, and n is the number of inputs. Let X_k be the probability an item selected according to the probability distribution in the $(k+1)^{st}$ iteration fires. We will set the length of a phase $s = \lfloor 1/\alpha \rfloor$.

First we compute the probability that, $X_{k+i} < X_k + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ holds for the entire phase, meaning for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. We call this event A_j where j denotes the phase. Recall the definition of β_i given in Lemma 5.7. For $1 \leq i \leq s = 1/\alpha$ and $n > 1/\alpha$, we have

$$\beta_{i,k} = ne^{-(k+i)\alpha} + \sum_{j=i}^{k+i-1} e^{-j\alpha} = ne^{-(k+i)\alpha} + e^{-i\alpha} \sum_{j=i}^{k-1} e^{-j\alpha} \geq ne^{-(k+i)\alpha} + \frac{1}{e} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} e^{-j\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{e^2\alpha}$$

where the final inequality follows from the observations that if $k < \frac{1}{\alpha}$ then $ne^{-(k+i)\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{e\alpha}$, and if $k \geq \frac{1}{\alpha}$, then $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} e^{-j\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{e\alpha}$. Note that $d_i < d_s = \frac{1-e^{-1}}{1-e^{-\alpha}} < \frac{1}{\alpha}$, so $\beta_{i,k} > \frac{d_i}{e}$. Lemma 5.7 implies that

$$\mathsf{Pr}[A_j] \geq 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{s} 1 - \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2\beta_{i,k}^2}{2d_i}\right) \geq \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2\beta_{i,k}^2}{2d_i}\right)\right) \geq \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{s} \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2\beta_{i,k}}{2e}\right)\right).$$

Therefore

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left[\overline{A}_j\right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{s} \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2\beta_{i,k}}{2e}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2e^3\alpha}\right).$$

Next, we compute the probability that the progress made in a phase is close to its expectation. We ignore the progress made in the first $\log n$ phases. Let B_j be the event that $X_{k+s} - \mathsf{E}\left[X_{k+s}\right] \leq \frac{\varepsilon_j X_k(1-t)}{32}$ where $k = \frac{j-1}{\alpha}$, $s = \frac{1}{\alpha}$, and $\varepsilon_j = t - X_k$, given $\overline{A}_j$ and $j \geq \log n$. First note that

$$W_{k+i} = ne^{-(k+i)\alpha} + \sum_{j=0}^{k+i-1} e^{-j\alpha} \leq ne^{-k\alpha} + \frac{2}{\alpha}.$$

Lemma 5.8 implies that

$$\mathsf{E}[X_{k+s}] \leq X_k \prod_{i=s/2}^{s} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_j(1-t)}{2W_{k+i}}\right) \leq X_k \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_j(1-t)}{2(ne^{-k\alpha} + \frac{2}{\alpha})}\right)^s \leq X_k \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_j(1-t)s}{4(ne^{-k\alpha} + \frac{2}{\alpha})}\right).$$

For $j \geq \log n$ phases, we have $k \geq \log n/\alpha$ and therefore,

$$\mathsf{E}[X_{k+s}] \leq X_k \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_j(1-t)}{16}\right).$$

We now show that with high probability, the actual progress made by each phase is close to its expectation. Let $z_1, \ldots z_s$ be indicator random variables where $z_i = \frac{e^{-(s-i)\alpha}}{d_s}$ if i the $(k+i)^{th}$ item fires, and let $Z = \sum_{i=1}^{s} z_i$. Note

$$X_{k+s} - \mathsf{E}[X_{k+s}] = \frac{d_s}{W_{k+s}} \left(Z - \mathsf{E}[Z]\right).$$

We apply the Hoeffding bound, noting that $\sum_{i=1}^{s}\left(\frac{e^{-(s-i)\alpha}}{d_s}\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{\alpha d_s^2}$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Pr}\left[\overline{B}_j\right] = \mathsf{Pr}\left[X_{k+s} - \mathsf{E}[X_{k+s}] > \frac{\varepsilon X_k(1-t)}{32}\right] &= \mathsf{Pr}\left[Z - \mathsf{E}[Z] > \frac{W_{k+s}\varepsilon X_k(1-t)}{32d_s}\right] \\
&< \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2(1-t)^2X_k^2W_{k+s}^2\alpha}{512}\right) \\
&< \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2(1-t)^2X_k^2}{512e^4\alpha}\right) \\
&= \mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2(1-t)^2X_k^2 2048e^4\log(\frac{4}{\varepsilon\delta})}{512e^4\min\{\varepsilon^2,\delta^2\}}\right) \\
&< \frac{(\delta\varepsilon)^4}{256}
\end{aligned}$$

The third step uses the fact that $W_{k+s} \geq \frac{1}{\alpha\varepsilon^2}$.

Next we compute the total number of phases needed before $X_k < \delta/3$ given A_j holds for all phases and assuming B_j holds after the first $\log n$ phases. For each phase after the first $\log n$ phases, we have

$$X_{k+s} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_j(1-t)}{32}\right)X_k.$$

We use the observation that if $y \geq \frac{1}{x}$, then $(1-x)^y \leq \frac{1}{e}$. Observe that

$$t\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon(1-t)}{32}\right)^{\lceil\frac{32}{\varepsilon(1-t)}\rceil} \leq \frac{t}{e} < \frac{t}{2}.$$

Thus, after $\lceil\frac{32}{\varepsilon(1-t)}\rceil$ phases, the current X_k is less than $t/2$. Similarly we compute

$$\frac{t}{2}\left(1 - \frac{t/2(1-t)}{32}\right)^{\lceil\frac{64\log\frac{3t}{2\delta}}{t(1-t)}\rceil} \leq \frac{t}{2}\left(\frac{1}{e}\right)^{\log\frac{3t}{2\delta}} = \frac{\delta}{3}.$$

and conclude that after an additional $\lceil\frac{64\log 3t/2\delta}{t(1-t)}\rceil$ phases the current X_k is less than $\delta/3$. We may assume $\varepsilon + \delta < t < 1 - \varepsilon - \delta$. The following is an upper bound on the total number of phases needed to have a failure probability less than $\delta/3$:

$$T = \log n + \frac{32}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{96}{\delta^2}.$$

It suffices to show that (i) the probability A_j holds for the first T phases is at least $1-\delta/3$ and (ii) the probability B_j holds for the latter $T - \log n$ phases is at least $1 - \delta/3$. We show (i) in two parts. First we analyze the probability of some event $\overline{A}_j$ in the for the first $\log n$ phases. We have

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left[\bigvee_{j=1}^{\log n}\overline{A}_j\right] \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\log n}\frac{1}{\alpha}\mathsf{exp}\left(\frac{-\varepsilon^2\max_i\{\beta_{i,\frac{j-1}{\alpha}}\}}{2e}\right).$$

For ease of notation, let $a = \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2e}\right)$. For $j = 1$, $\beta_{i,0} \geq \frac{n}{e}$. For $j > 1$, note $\beta_{i,\frac{j-1}{\alpha}} \geq \frac{n}{e^j} + \frac{1}{e^2\alpha}$. We rewrite the above expression.

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left[\bigvee_{j=1}^{\log n} \overline{A}_j\right] \leq a^{\frac{n}{e}} + a^{\frac{1}{e^2\alpha}} \sum_{j=2}^{\log n} a^{\frac{n}{e^j}} = a^{\frac{n}{e}} + a^{\frac{1}{e^2\alpha}} \left(\frac{1-a}{1-a^{1/e}}\right) \leq 3a^{\frac{1}{e^2\alpha}}.$$

Observe

$$\mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2e^3\alpha}\right) = \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2 2048e^4 \log 4/\varepsilon\delta}{2e^3 \min\{\varepsilon^2, \delta^2\}}\right) \leq \frac{(\varepsilon\delta)^{1024e}}{256}.$$

Next we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{Pr}\left[\bigvee_{j=1}^{T} \overline{A}_j\right] &\leq \left(3 + \frac{T - \log n}{\alpha}\right) \mathsf{exp}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2e^3\alpha}\right) \\
&\leq \left(3 + \left(\frac{32}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{96}{\delta^2}\right)\left(\frac{2048e^4 \log \frac{4}{\varepsilon\delta}}{\min\{\varepsilon^2, \delta^2\}}\right)\right) \frac{(\varepsilon\delta)^{1024e}}{256} \\
&< \frac{\delta}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Statement (ii) follows from the calculation:

$$\mathsf{Pr}\left[\bigvee_{j=\log n}^{T} \overline{B_j}\right] \leq \left(\frac{32}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{96}{\delta^2}\right) \frac{(\varepsilon\delta)^4}{256} < \frac{\delta}{3}.$$

We have shown after $T = \Omega(\log(n/\varepsilon\delta)$ phases the next item will fire with probability less than δ. Since each phase has $1/\alpha$ new items, the total new items created to achieve this is

$$\Omega\left(\frac{\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta}}{\min\{\varepsilon^2, \delta^2\}} \left(\log \frac{n}{\varepsilon\delta}\right)\right).$$

□

Finally, we note the lemmas and theorems in this section hold up to modification of constants for wild and exponential constructions corresponding to constructions given in Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.7, which exhibit quadratic convergence in the iterative tree setting. However, unlike in the leveled iterative construction, in the exponential and wild constructions we do not see asymptotically faster convergence than the corresponding linear constructions, even in the quadratic regime. In our analysis of the latter constructions, we track the probability that the sequence of $X_k's$ goes to zero faster than iterating on curve $g(p)$ that is a weighted average of $f(p)$ and the function p. Regardless of whether $f(p)$ has quadratic behavior, $g(p)$ has a linear term, implying $g(p)$ exhibits linear convergence. Since this yardstick function $g(p)$ exhibits linear convergence, this analysis will not yield asymptotically improved results for functions with quadratic convergence.

6 Learning

So far we have studied the realizability of thresholds via neurally plausible simple iterative constructions. These constructions were based on prior knowledge of the target threshold. Here we study the learnability of thresholds from examples. It is important that the learning algorithm should be neurally plausible and not overly specialized to the learning task. We believe the simple results presented here are suggestive of considerably richer possibilities.

We begin with a one-shot learning algorithm. We show that given a single example of a string $X \in \{0,1\}^n$ with $\|X\|_1 = tn$, we can build an iterative tree that computes a t-threshold function with high probability. Let T_1 and T_2 be the building block trees in the construction given in Theorem 1.3. The simple LearnThreshold algorithm, described below, has the guarantee stated in Theorem 1.11, which follows from Theorem 1.3.

LearnThreshold(L, m, X)**:**
Input: Levels parameter L, a string $X \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $\|X\|_1 = tn$, width parameter m.
Output: A finite realization of iterative tree with width m.

For each level j from 1 to L, apply the following iteration m times:
(level 0 consists of the input items X)

1. Pick a random input item i.
2. If $X_i = 1$ then let $T = T_1$, else let $T = T_2$.
3. Pick 3 items from the previous level.
4. Build T with these items as leaves.

7 Discussion

We have seen that very simple, distributed algorithms requiring minimal global coordination and control can lead to stable and efficient constructions of important classes of functions. Our work raises several interesting questions.

1. What are the ways in which threshold functions are applied in cognition? Object recognition is one application of threshold functions in cognition. For instance, suppose we have items representing features such as "trunk," "grey," "wrinkled skin," and "big ears," and an item representing our concept of an "elephant." If a certain threshold of items representing the features we associate with an elephant fire, then the "elephant" item will fire. This structure lends itself to a hierarchical organization of concepts that is consistent with the fact that as we learn, we build on our existing set of knowledge. For example, when a toddler learns to identify an elephant, he does not need to re-learn how to identify an ear. The item representing "ear" already exists and will fire as a result of some threshold function created when the toddler learned to identify ears.

Now the item representing "ear" may be used as an input as the toddler learns to identify elephants and other animals.

2. What is an interesting model and neurally plausible algorithm for learning threshold functions of k relevant input items? In this scenario, the input is a set of sparse binary strings of length n representing examples in which at least tk of k relevant items are firing. The output is an iterative tree that computes a t-threshold function on the k relevant items. We can formulate the previously described example of learning to identify an elephant as an instance of this problem. Each time the toddler sees an example of an elephant, many features associated with elephant will fire in addition to some features that are not associated with elephants. There may also be features associated with an elephant that are not present in the example and therefore not firing. A learning algorithm must rely on information about the items that are currently firing to learn both the set of relevant items and a threshold function on this set of items. It might also be beneficial to utilize prediction, as e.g., done by Papadimitriou and Vempala [2015a].

3. To what extent can general linear threshold functions with general weights be constructed/learned by cortical algorithms?

4. A concrete question is whether the construction of Theorem 1.7 is optimal, similar to the optimality of the constructions in Theorem 1.5.

5. A simple way to include non monotone Boolean functions with the same constructions as we study here, would be to have input items together with their negations (as in e.g., [Savicky, 1990]). What functions can be realized this way, using a distribution on a small set of fixed-size trees?

References

Rosa I. Arriaga and Santosh Vempala. An algorithmic theory of learning: Robust concepts and random projection. *Machine Learning*, 63(2):161–182, 2006. doi: 10.1007/s10994-006-6265-7. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10994-006-6265-7`.

Rosa I. Arriaga, David Rutter, Maya Cakmak, and Santosh S. Vempala. Visual categorization with random projection. *Neural Computation*, 27(10):2132–2147, 2015. doi: 10.1162/NECO_a_00769. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/NECO_a_00769`.

Ravi B. Boppana. Amplification of probabilistic boolean formulas. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1985., 26th Annual Symposium on*, pages 20–29, Oct 1985. doi: 10.1109/SFCS.1985.5.

Alex Brodsky and Nicholas Pippenger. The boolean functions computed by random boolean formulas or how to grow the right function. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 27(4):490–519, 2005. ISSN 1098-2418. doi: 10.1002/rsa.20095. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/rsa.20095`.

M. Dubiner and U. Zwick. Amplification and percolation [probabilistic boolean functions]. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1992. Proceedings., 33rd Annual Symposium on*, pages 258–267, Oct 1992. doi: 10.1109/SFCS.1992.267766.

Vitaly Feldman and Leslie G. Valiant. Experience-induced neural circuits that achieve high capacity. *Neural Computation*, 21(10):2715–2754, 2009. doi: 10.1162/neco.2009.08-08-851.

Hervé Fournier, Danièle Gardy, and Antoine Genitrini. Balanced and/or trees and linear threshold functions. In *Proceedings of the Meeting on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics*, ANALCO '09, pages 51–57, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2009. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. URL `http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2791158.2791166`.

Joel Friedman. Constructing O($nlogn$) size monotone formulae for the k^{th} threshold function of n boolean variables. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 15(3):641–654, 1986.

Sally A Goldman, Michael J Kearns, and Robert E Schapire. Exact identification of read-once formulas using fixed points of amplification functions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 22(4):705–726, 1993.

Shlomo Hoory, Avner Magen, and Toniann Pitassi. Monotone circuits for the majority function. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 410–425. Springer, 2006.

Michael Luby, Michael Mitzenmacher, and Mohammad Amin Shokrollahi. Analysis of random processes via and-or tree evaluation. In *SODA*, volume 98, pages 364–373, 1998.

Edward F Moore and Claude E Shannon. Reliable circuits using less reliable relays. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 262(3):191–208, 1956.

Christos H. Papadimitriou and Santosh S. Vempala. Cortical learning via prediction. In *Proc. of COLT*, 2015a.

Christos H. Papadimitriou and Santosh S. Vempala. Cortical computation. In *Proc. of PODC*, 2015b.

E. Rosch. Principles of categorization. In Eleanor Rosch and Barbara Lloyd, editors, *Cognition and Categorization*. Lawrence Elbaum Associates, 1978.

Eleanor Rosch, Carolyn B. Mervis, Wayne D. Gray, David M. Johnson, and Penny Boyes-braem. Basic objects in natural categories. *COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY*, 8:382–439, 1976.

Petr Savicky. Boolean functions represented by random formulas. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 28(2):397–398, 1987.

Petr Savicky. Random boolean formulas representing any boolean function with asymptotically equal probability. *Discrete Mathematics*, 83(1):95 – 103, 1990. ISSN 0012-365X. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(90)90223-5. URL `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0012365X90902235`.

Rocco A. Servedio. Monotone boolean formulas can approximate monotone linear threshold functions. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 142(13):181 – 187, 2004. ISSN 0166-218X. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2004.02.003. URL `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166218X04000174`. Boolean and Pseudo-Boolean Functions.

Leslie G. Valiant. Short monotone formulae for the majority function. *Journal of Algorithms*, 5(3), 1984.

Leslie G. Valiant. *Circuits of the mind*. Oxford University Press, 1994. ISBN 978-0-19-508926-4.

Leslie G. Valiant. A neuroidal architecture for cognitive computation. *J. ACM*, 47(5): 854–882, 2000. doi: 10.1145/355483.355486.

Leslie G. Valiant. Memorization and association on a realistic neural model. *Neural Computation*, 17(3):527–555, 2005. doi: 10.1162/0899766053019890.

8 Appendix

Degree	Polynomials in $\mathcal{A}$
1	(0,1)
2	(0, 0, 1) (0, 2, -1)
3	(0, 0, 0, 1) (0, 1, 1, -1) (0, 0, 2, -1) (0, 3, -3, 1))
4	((0, 0, 0, 0, 1) (0, 1, 0, 1, -1) (0, 0, 1, 1, -1) (0, 2, 0, -2, 1) (0, 0, 0, 2, -1) (0, 1, 2, -3, 1) (0, 0, 3, -3, 1) (0, 4, -6, 4, -1) (0, 0, 2, 0, -1) (0, 0, 4, -4, 1))

Degree	Polynomials in $\mathcal{A}$
5	(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1) (0, 1, 0, 0, 1, -1) (0, 0, 1, 0, 1, -1) (0, 2, -1, 1, -2, 1) (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, -1) (0, 1, 1, 0, -2, 1) (0, 0, 2, 0, -2, 1) (0, 3, -2, -2, 3, -1) (0, 0, 0, 0, 2, -1) (0, 1, 0, 2, -3, 1) (0, 0, 1, 2, -3, 1) (0, 2, 1, -5, 4, -1) (0, 0, 0, 3, -3, 1) (0, 1, 3, -6, 4, -1) (0, 0, 4, -6, 4, -1) (0, 5, -10, 10, -5, 1) (0, 0, 0, 2, 0, -1) (0, 1, 2, -2, -1, 1) (0, 0, 0, 4, -4, 1) (0, 1, 4, -8, 5, -1) (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, -1) (0, 0, 3, -1, -2, 1) (0, 0, 2, 1, -3, 1) (0, 0, 6, -9, 5, -1)

Table 1: Achievable polynomials for AND/OR trees. The polynomial $a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + a_3x^3 + a_4x^4 + a_5x^5$ is denoted by $(a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5)$.